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The ASFA Advisory Board is described under Article VIII of the ASFA Partnership Agreement which all ASFA Partners have signed. The full Partnership Agreement can be seen on the FAO Document Repository http://www.fao.org/3/a-an690e.pdf. The three paragraphs, from Article VIII, containing the key functions of the Board are:

paragraph 8.1 – The functions of the ASFA Advisory Board (the "Board") shall be to decide upon, and oversee the implementation of policy matters with respect to the ASFA service.

paragraph 8.2 – Each ASFA Partner shall be entitled to nominate one member of the Board, who should be a person invested with authority to commit the expenditure of the resources of the ASFA Partner concerned.

paragraph 8.4 – Members of the Board shall be adequately prepared to discuss and evaluate the issues raised at each meeting of the Board.

The Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board has been meeting annually since the beginning of the ASFA service/system in 1970.

Besides providing an opportunity to establish contacts and to provide a forum for discussing the ongoing maintenance and the future development of the ASFA system, the Meeting also serves as a moment of “accountability” for all the ASFA Partners. This is because all the Partners must, both during the Meeting and in their Reports to the Meeting, render public what they have (or have not) accomplished during the intersessional period.

There is little doubt that the annual ASFA Board Meetings are an important factor in keeping the “momentum” going in a system which may be easily subject to stasis because of its highly decentralized nature and the lack of direct monetary subsidies as an incentive for input production.

Note regarding this document: This document is published electronically only and contains the Minutes of the meeting as recorded by the Assistant Rapporteur Ms Tamsin Vicary (FAO) and edited by the Rapporteur Ms Maria Kalentsits (FAO), the List of Documents, the List of Participants and Consolidated Outcomes of the discussions held at the meeting. All the ASFA Partners reports and other related documentation is available from the ASFA Secretariat (ASFA-Secretariat@fao.org) upon request.
1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The 46th Annual Meeting of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board was hosted by the UNESCO/IOC Project Office for IODE (International Oceanographic Data and Information Exchange Program) and took place from 11 to 15 June 2018 in Oostende, Belgium. The Meeting was attended by 31 participants from: 25 National ASFA Partners, 2 UN ASFA Partners, 2 International ASFA Partners, and the ASFA Publishing Partner.

The Agenda is in Annex-1. The names and addresses of the participants are listed in Annex-1b. The documents presented at the Meeting and the abbreviations used in the Report are listed in Annex-1a and 1c, respectively.

Mr Ian Pettman welcomed the participants and remarked there were a number of new participants. The meeting was opened Mr Peter Pissierssens (IOC) and Mr Marc Taconet (FAO).

Mr  Pissierssens (IOC), in his capacity as the Head of the UNESCO/IOC Project Office for IODE, addressed the participants and welcomed them to Ostend. Mr Pissierssens remarked upon the confusion of the terms ‘information’ and ‘data’, which can often be mistakenly used as synonyms. Along with the proliferation of the use of Google among researchers, scientists and students, this confusion is challenging the role of librarians. These challenges mean the role of librarian is often misunderstood. However, IODE is working towards transformation the role of librarian. Libraries around the world are being closed and many special libraries, such as marine or aquatic science libraries, are being merged. Many ASFA Partners will have suffered that transformation or change in recent years. IODE was one of founding partners of ASFA in the 1970s. Mr Possesses has challenged the participants with questions: is the ASFA of today fit for purpose? What will ASFA be tomorrow?

Mr Pissierssens mentioned that the UNESCO/IOC Project Office for IODE opened in 2005, IODE is traditionally involved in data and information management. It provides training for data managers and there has been a lot of intergenerational training. The Project Office was set up in Ostend for that purpose and runs 8 courses a year for approx. 20 people. However, travel was difficult for many participants travelling from far away, also courses in English was not a good option for many participants. For that reason, regional centres were set up and IODE now has 9 regional training centres around the world, covering most of the official languages and avoiding long travels. IODE is now able to train more people than before. Mr Pissierssens expressed his hope to get feedback from the large group of ASFA Partners on their training requirements at this ASFA meeting, to see what training will be required in the future.

Mr Taconet (FAO) addressed participants on behalf of FAO. He expressed his gratitude to the Host. The full transcript of Mr Taconet’s speech is available in the appendix of these minutes. Mr Taconet’s speech noted that the performance and sustainability of ASFA depends on ASFA’s ability to respond to user expectations and convince supporters that it is worth pursuing. He was happy to see 33 ASFA partners participating the meeting, an impressive group which demonstrates the commitment from more than half the partners. Mr Taconet noted that the ASFA Board meeting did not take place last year. He also mentioned some important issues such as changes concerning the ASFA Secretariat staff as well as a decrease in the royalties received from ProQuest. Mr Taconet said that these two facts testify that we are in an increasingly competitive global environment. ASFA partners must reflect on this, and the need for change is the theme for this meeting. He mentioned that the partners need to realise that ASFA cannot afford the business as usual approach, and the agenda has been set up to begin the process of transition. The meeting will address the Impact Evaluation (IE), which will assess the value of ASFA and make adaptations to the business model. The aim is to have the results of IE in 2019, an advanced report on options for business model, fit for global audience. The IE report should demonstrate how ASFA can support the key themes for FAO (for example, sustainable fisheries, gender). Mr Taconet has invited all ASFA Partners to contribute to the IE, and to try to ‘think outside the box’. How should ASFA and its Secretariat function differently? How can ASFA be more visible? What are the opportunities from the open data paradigm? Mr Taconet called for the need for strategic advisers who can help shape directions during this period of change.
2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS
Mr Pettman (FBA) presented this Agenda Item.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEURS
Mr Pettman (FBA) chaired the Meeting and the Agenda was completed on time. The main rapporteur was Ms Maria Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) and Ms Tamsin Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) was assistant rapporteur.

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA
The Agenda, as it appears in Annex-1, was adopted by the Board.

5. ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT OF THE 2016 MEETING
The ASFA Board agreed to adopt the Summary Report of the 2016 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Ha Noi, Viet Nam). ASFA/2018/2. No objections were raised.

5.1 Matters Arising from 2016 Meeting
The follow-up taken by Partners on last year’s "action items" is reported under the appropriate Agenda item. No comments were made at this point.

6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP
6.1 General status of the ASFA Partnership
Most of this section is covered in ASFA/2018/3, in section 4.2 on page four of the FAO report.
Ms Maria Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the document ASFA/2018/3 which provides a list of the ASFA Partners and their Collaborating Centres and asked ASFA Partners to verify that their information was correct. She requested any changes to be reported to the FAO ASFA Secretariat so that the file could be updated, also to make changes throughout the year.

6.2 Report on the Intersessional Activities of ASFA Partners
Each ASFA Partner presented a summary Report of its own intersessional activities. The FAO ASFA Secretariat summarized the major points contained in the Reports of Partners not in attendance.
Mr Pettman (FBA) reminded ASFA Partners that they should bring up any important issues they had highlighted in their intersessional reports during the appropriate Agenda Item later on during the meeting.

6.2.1 United Nations Co-sponsors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Mr Taconet presented the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN/DOALOS</td>
<td>Not present – report highlighted by Ms Kalentsits (ASFA/2018/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Environment (formerly UNEP)</td>
<td>Not present – No Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.2 ASFA Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADRIAMED</td>
<td>Not present, report highlighted by Ms Kalentsits (ASFA/2018/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCAT</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldFish Center</td>
<td>Not present, report highlighted by Ms Kalentsits (ASFA/2018/9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTC</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFO</td>
<td>Ms Pacey presented the NAFO report (ASFA/2018/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMRIS</td>
<td>Not present, report highlighted by Ms Kalentsits (ASFA/2018/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAFDEC</td>
<td>Mr Superio presented the SEAFDEC/AQD report (ASFA/2018/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCPFC</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina (INIDEP)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana (ORI)</td>
<td>Ms Silvoni presented the INIDEP report (ASFA/2018/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (USP)</td>
<td>Ms Pureza presented the USP report (ASFA/2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Fisheries &amp; Oceans)</td>
<td>Ms Pacey presented the CFO report (ASFA/2018/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile (IFOP)</td>
<td>Not present, report highlighted by Ms Kalentsits (ASFA/2018/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (NMDIS)</td>
<td>Ms Dong presented the NMDIS report (ASFA/2018/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire (CRO)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba (CIP)</td>
<td>Mr Tizol Correa presented the CIP report (ASFA/2018/24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador (INP)</td>
<td>Mr Gaibor presented the INP report (ASFA/2018/25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (NIOF)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia (EMI)</td>
<td>Ms Tiivel presented the EMI report (ASFA/2018/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (IFREMER)</td>
<td>Ms Prod’homme presented the IFREMER report (ASFA/2018/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (HCMR)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland (MRI)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (NIO/NICMAS)</td>
<td>Mr Mathamparambil presented NIO/NICMAS report (ASFA/2018/31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia (PDII/LIPI)</td>
<td>Ms Sitepu presented the PDII/LIPI report (ASFA/2018/32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (IFRO)</td>
<td>Ms Jamili presented the IFRO report (ASFA/2018/33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland (MI)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (SIBM)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (FRA)</td>
<td>Mr Noguchi presented the FRA report (ASFA/2018/36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya (KMFRI)</td>
<td>Mr Macharia presented the KMFRI report (ASFA/2018/37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea (KIOST)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao (LARReC)</td>
<td>Mr Phouthavong presented the LARReC report (ASFA/2018/39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia (UMT)</td>
<td>Mr Zuraimi presented the UMT report (ASFA/2018/40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania (IMROP)</td>
<td>Mr Sakho presented the IMROP report (No written report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (INRH)</td>
<td>Ms Bazi presented the INRH report (ASFA/2018/43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique (INAHINA)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia (NatMIRC)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria (NIFFR)</td>
<td>Ms Sado presented the NIFFR report (ASFA/2018/46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway (IMR)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru (IMARPE)</td>
<td>Ms Arce Ventocilla presented the IMARPE report (ASFA/2018/48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (UPV)</td>
<td>Ms Linaugo presented the UPV report (ASFA/2018/49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (NMFRI)</td>
<td>Ms Fey presented the NMFRI report (ASFA/2018/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal (IPMAR)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation (VNIRO)</td>
<td>Ms Levashova presented the VNIRO report (ASFA/2018/52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal (DPM)</td>
<td>Ms Keita presented the DPM report (ASFA/2018/53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (IEO)</td>
<td>Not present, report highlighted by Ms Kalentsits (ASFA/2018/54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania (IMS)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand (Chula)</td>
<td>Not present – No report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia (INSTM)</td>
<td>Not present, report highlighted by Ms Kalentsits (ASFA/2018/57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda (NaFIRRI)</td>
<td>Ms Endra presented the NaFIRRI report (ASFA/2018/58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine (BO MTCA)</td>
<td>Ms Kulakova presented the BO MTCA report (ASFA/2018/59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (FBA)</td>
<td>Mr Pettman presented the FBA report (ASFA/2018/60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay (IIP)</td>
<td>Ms Cristiani presented the IIP report (ASFA/2018/61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA (NOAA)</td>
<td>Not present, report highlighted by Ms Kalentsits (ASFA/2018/62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam (CIS)</td>
<td>Ms Hau presented the CIS report (ASFA/2018/63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASFA partners reported on the particular areas which are covered in more detail under the appropriate agenda item: problems with using the software (particularly using the Virtual Machine); searching ASFA online on PQ platform; several institutions requested training and others also raised the need for end-user
training. Partners also discussed the importance of raising awareness of ASFA particularly among younger users.

6.2.2 ASFA Publisher

| ProQuest | Ms McCoy presented the ProQuest Report (ASFA/2018/64) |

6.3 New ASFA Partners

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that during the intersessional period, one new National Partner joined the ASFA network. The University of Malaysia, Terengganu (UMT) signed the ASFA Partnership Agreement in June 2017. The full address of the new ASFA Partner is in ASFA/2018/67. Ceremonial applause was given to the Malaysian partner, Mr Mohd Shahrulnizam Zuraimi. Thanks were given to Mr Superio (SEAFDEC) for his assistance in the successful recruitment and training of Malaysian ASFA Partner.

In 2016, Eight (8) Philippine Collaborating Centres joined the ASFA network. The ASFA inputters were trained by SEAFDEC (D. Superio) in 2017; 5 of them are regularly submitting input.

- Aklan State University
- Bicol University - Tabaco Campus
- Bohol Island State University – Candijay Campus
- Iloilo State College of Fisheries
- Mindanao State University- Naawan
- Pangasinan State University - Binmaley Campus
- Samar State University - Mercedes Campus
- Western Philippines University

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that in April 2018, the Central Fisheries Research Institute – Trabzon expressed an interest in becoming the Turkish National ASFA partner. At this writing, the ASFA Partnership agreement is being signed. They will have three titles on their MONLIS. Ms Kalentsits agreed to discuss with Paula McCoy the process of transferring titles from PQ Monitoring List to the Monitoring List of a new National Partner.

6.4 Partners dropping out of ASFA

Information on this topic is given in section 4.2.2, page 5, of the FAO report.

Johann Heinrich von Thunen-Institute – The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that Germany - Johann Heinrich von Thunen-Institute (ex-Bundesforschungsanstalt fuer Fisherei (BF) and its Collaborating ASFA Centre located in Hamburg, Bergedorf have dropped from the Partnership in 2016. Ms Kalentsits also reported that three institutions in Germany were contacted but no response was received. The ASFA Secretariat is therefore continue seeking a new National Partner in Germany.

NACA – Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the ASFA Secretariat has contacted NACA regarding their status in the ASFA partnership.

Follow-up Action Item 5 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

5. Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by NACA (Thailand)...no further communication between FAO ASFA Secretariat and NACA...

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to contact NACA in order to inform them that they will be dropped from the ASFA Partnership unless they confirm interest in remaining within the Partnership.

The Secretariat was informed by Mr S. Wilkinson that NACA has a very small staff and is heavily reliant on automation for delivery of electronic services. The possibility for NACA to resume submission of the ASFA input was discussed at a managerial level and the decision has been taken to drop off from the ASFA partnership. However, NACA continues to make full-text electronic versions of all of our publications available in PDF format via their website. Anything to which NACA holds copyright is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution license. ASFA retains NACA permission to redistribute its publications free of charge, including in its own commercial products, with attribution of the original source.
Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that this Collaborating ASFA Centre has dropped from the Partnership in 2018.

6.5 Partners removed or in danger of being removed from ASFA

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported on the status of those ASFA Partners who were no longer submitting ASFA records to the publisher, referring to the ‘Call to Attention’ List that was provided under Item 4.3 of the FAO Report (Annex-3) which included the ASFA Partners who were in danger of being removed from the ASFA Partnership for not submitting ASFA input for several years. Before discussing the situation regarding each of the ASFA Partners in this list, Ms Kalentsits mentioned Mauritania and Tanzania who are in need of training, which the ASFA Secretariat is trying to arrange, hopefully at the IAMSLIC conference in October 2018.

Institutions whose problems are being resolved:

**Worldfish:** The FAO ASFA Secretariat contacted WorldFish in February 2018

Follow-up Action Item 2 from the 2016 Board Meeting:

2. Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by Worldfish …. No input submitted since 2014…. in their Intersessional Report Mr Ko states ASFA inputting not considered priority …. science publications deposited with the Aquatic Commons, as it requires less time in completing each record and the aquatic commons is open access.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to contact Mr Ko (Worldfish) to obtain more information regarding the situation at Worldfish and attempt to resolve the situation

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the institution has successfully re-installed the ASFA input software. WorldFish has problems with staffing but hopes to resume ASFA input this year.

**Mozambique (INAHINA):** The FAO ASFA Secretariat has been informed that a new librarian has joined the institution and is responsible for the ASFA input. He requires training and the software needs to be installed.

**Cote d'Ivoire (CRO):** Ms Arame Keita (DPM) provided the details of the contact persons at CRO. The FAO ASFA Secretariat contacted CRO in March 2018

Follow-up Action Item 13 from the 2016 Board Meeting:

13. Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by CRO (Cote d'Ivoire) …. pending re-training ……. FAO ASFA Secretariat considering the possibility of having the training carried out by one of the French speaking ASFA Partners… not yet possible ….Ms Keita (DPM) reported a change in librarian staff.

Ms Keita (DPM) agreed to provide the contact details of the new librarian at CRO to the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up with the new contact person at CRO to see if they were still interested in participating in ASFA.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the details of the new ASFA contact person were communicated to the ASFA Secretariat however, the training and (re)installation of the ASFA input software is pending hiring a new librarian who should soon join the institute.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners that their primary responsibility as an ASFA Partner was the preparation and submission of ASFA input to the ASFA Publisher for inclusion in the ASFA bibliographic database, as indicated in the ASFA Partnership Agreement, and that if an ASFA Partner did not fulfil this responsibility they risked removal from the ASFA Partnership.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that, when examining the case of an ASFA Partner no longer submitting ASFA records, the FAO ASFA Secretariat always referred to the criteria that existed for removing ASFA Partners for not fulfilling their input responsibilities. These criteria had been added as an amendment to the ASFA Partnership in 2008, and are included each year as a footnote under item 4.1 of the FAO Report.
However, Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that these criteria had been always applied with some flexibility, taking into consideration the serious, political, economic and climatic hardships that some ASFA Partners could be facing, which could hamper ASFA input production. The purpose of the ‘Call to Attention’ List was to alert those ASFA Partners who were not submitting input or who were having difficulties in submitting input. Ms Kalentsits stressed how important it was that an ASFA Partner inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat should they face difficulties in fulfilling their input responsibilities. She added that the FAO ASFA Secretariat would always do their best to provide support whenever possible, since it was their primary goal to recruit and train ASFA Partners rather than remove them from the Partnership.

**ASFA Partners called to attention:**

**Egypt/NIOF** – Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat liaised with Ms Nicoletta Milone (ADRIAMED) and Ms Paula Anton (FIAS) and tried to contact Egypt regarding ASFA via e-mail several times in 2018 with no success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-up Action Item 11 from the 2016 Board Meeting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Regarding the status of submission of records by NIOF Egypt) ..... the FAO ASFA Secretariat organized an ASFA training session in Rome for two persons from NIOF ..... training was carried out by the AdriaMed ASFA Partner ..... no input has been submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to liaise with Ms Milone (AdriaMED) regarding the status of NIOF as an ASFA Partner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to make one final attempt to contact NIOF.**

**Iceland/MRI** - Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat contacted MFRI (the institute was established in July 2016 as a result of a merger of the Institute of Freshwater Fisheries and the Marine Research Institute (MRI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-up Action Item 7 from the 2016 Board Meeting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by MRI (Iceland) ..... last input was submitted in 2010 ..... communication in 2013 indicated that MRI were reorganizing the institute and also having new computers ..... no further communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up with MRI in order to inform them that they will be dropped from the ASFA Partnership unless they confirm interest in remaining within the Partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FAO ASFA Secretariat was informed that Ms. María Ásdís Stefánsdóttir, MFRI librarian was been assigned by the MFRI director as a contact person. At this writing, The Secretariat is awaiting a reply from MRI.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up with MRI after the meeting.**

**IOTC** – IOTC has notified the FAO ASFA Secretariat of its intention to drop out of ASFA. However, later on, IOTC has asked for further time to reflect. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat contacted Mr Chris O’Brien, the Secretary of IOTC in April 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-up Action Item 9 from the 2016 Board Meeting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by IOTC ..... IOTC was looking for someone to assist them in preparation of ASFA input for them ..... IOTC had contacted NIO and KMFRI ..... there had been a change in Executive Secretary ..... the recently appointed acting Secretary of IOTC (located within FAO) has asked for further time to reflect ..... he would follow up regarding the hiring of someone to carry out ASFA input for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up and discuss further with Mr Anganuzzi (FAO) regarding the status of IOTC as an ASFA Partner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this writing, the FAO ASFA Secretariat is awaiting a reply from IOTC.

**SPC** - The last input submitted by SPC was in 2014. The FAO ASFA Secretariat was informed that Ms Ame has left the SPC in December 2017. The ASFA Secretariat has been in contact with SPC (Ms Stephanie
Watt: stephaniew@spc.int) in February and April 2018 regarding the ASFA partnership. At this writing, the ASFA Secretariat is awaiting a reply from SPC.

**UN Environment (formerly UNEP)** - The FAO ASFA Secretariat has contacted UN Environment (contact details provided by Mika Odido, IOC Coordinator in Africa, UNESCO Regional Office for Eastern Africa, regarding UN Environment’s continuing participation in the ASFA Partnership in February 2018.

The Secretariat was informed that Ms Anja-Katharina Von Moltke (anja.moltke@un.org) has been assigned as a contact person at UNEP. At time of writing, the ASFA Secretariat is awaiting a reply from UN Environment.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to make another attempt to contact UN Environment. The Secretariat will keep open the possibility for UN Environment to resume active participation in the ASFA Partnership.

**Situations Pending:**

**Namibia/NatMIRC:** Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the training is still pending.

**Thailand/Chulalongkorn University:** Mr Superio (SEAFDEC) was in contact with the institution again after it voted on a Trust Fund proposal during intersession however, there was no reply.Mr Superio reported that he also contacted the Kasetsart University regarding their possible participation in ASFA.

**Follow-up Action Item 8 from the 2016 Board Meeting:**

8. Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by UNEP ... FAO ASFA Secretariat ... contacted KMFRI regarding UNEP’s ASFA input preparation ... no reply yet from KMFRI ... Mr Macharia reported an attempt was made with assistance by Mr Odido (UNESCO in Nairobi) to contact UNEP, but the person previously responsible for ASFA had left.

**Mr Macharia (KMFRI) agreed** to follow up and make one final attempt to contact someone at UNEP to obtain information regarding their status in the ASFA Partnership.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the ASFA Secretariat was in contact with the NatMIRC in June 2018 regarding the possibility for NatMIRC librarian to attend the ASFA training in Uganda.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the ASFA Secretariat was in contact with the NatMIRC in June 2018 regarding the possibility for NatMIRC librarian to attend the ASFA training in Uganda.

**Thailand/Chulalongkorn University:** Mr Superio (SEAFDEC) was in contact with the institution again after it voted on a Trust Fund proposal during intersession however, there was no reply. Mr Superio reported that he also contacted the Kasetsart University regarding their possible participation in ASFA.
WCPFC: Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that there was no follow-up during the intersessional period.

Follow-up Action Item 16 from the 2016 Board Meeting:

16. Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by WCPFC …….changes in the director had hampered communication …new contact details obtained by FAO ASFA Secretariat …

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to make one final attempt to follow up with WCPFC regarding the status of their participation in ASFA.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up after the meeting.

Partners removed from Partnership:

Bulgaria/IO: Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that there has been no contact from this institution since the librarian informed the FAO ASFA Secretariat that she is not able to provide ASFA input. After several unsuccessful attempts by the ASFA Secretariat to contact IO Director during the intersessional period, the institution has been removed from partnership.

Follow-up Action Item 10 from the 2016 Board Meeting:

10. Regarding the status of submission of records by IO (Bulgaria) …..an ASFA training session was carried out after the 2015 IAMSLIC meeting in Rome and invited IO to participate in the training in an attempt to reactivate IO’s participation in ASFA. …..No input has been submitted …..FAO ASFA Secretariat has received notification that the ASFA contact person at IO has retired.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up with the Director of IO regarding their status in the ASFA Partnership.

Ghana/CSIR: Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that after several unsuccessful attempts to contact CSIR during the intersessional period, the institution was removed from the ASFA Partnership in January 2018.

Follow-up Action Item 3 from the 2016 Board Meeting:

3. Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by CSIR/WRI (Ghana) ……. The FAO ASFA Secretariat has informed CSIR/WRI that it is in the process of being removed from the ASFA Partnership……. A reply was received in June 2016 from the Director saying he would look into the situation at CSIR/WRI and endeavour to re-assume ASFA input submission. ….Nothing further received …..

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to contact CSIR (Ghana) in order to notify them that, unless some ASFA input would be forthcoming, they will be dropped from the ASFA Partnership.

Guinea/CNSHB: Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the institution was removed from the ASFA Partnership in March 2018 after several attempts to contact them failed. The last ASFA input was received in 2010.

Follow-up Action Item 6 from the 2016 Board Meeting:

6. Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by CNSHB (Guinea) … last input was in 2010…communication had been very erratic …..

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to make one final attempt to contact CNSHB in order to inform them that they will be dropped from the ASFA Partnership unless they confirm interest in remaining within the Partnership.
A table of ASFA input numbers for all ASFA Partners was distributed. The table divided the partners into those who had done more than 100 ASFA records per year (coloured green); those who had input between 1-100 records (amber); and those who had not submitted ASFA input (coloured red). Institutions coloured red or orange were encouraged to speak to the ASFA Secretariat at this meeting to explain the problems they were facing, as there may be a way that the ASFA Secretariat can help.

6.6 Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the FAO Report, section 4.5.1 (document ASFA/2018/3): Guiding expansion of ASFA Partnership. Aside to the issue of future expansion, Partners were asked to use this opportunity to think of the structure of the FAO Report – would Partners like this basic information included in every report or perhaps it would be better stored on a stable location online and not included in the report?

The strategy for future expansion is based on the same information reported in 2002: The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that when making efforts to recruit new ASFA Partners, reference was always made to 2 particular papers: Strategy for priority setting for future Expansion of the ASFA Partnership, by YongJa Cho (presented at the 2002 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting); and, Criteria for recruitment and approval of new Partners contained in the ASFA Partnership Agreement (Article V) which was presented and approved at the 1998 Meeting. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the FAO Report, (ASFA/2018/3, Section 4.5.1) which provided details of these 2 papers and gave an outline of the strategy that the FAO ASFA Secretariat applied when recruiting new ASFA Partners.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) also referred to the criteria contained in the ASFA partnership agreement as Article 5, which covered the recruitment and approval of new partners. These criteria include: monitoring of serials and monographs for inclusion in the ASFA database; ensuring the highest quality in monitoring the literature and in the preparation of ASFA input; and also allocating the necessary resources to fulfil the above two items. She stressed the importance of having the staff that had the time necessary to do this work.

On page 8 of the FAO report there is a table showing ASFA Partners by region and a comparison of ASFA Partners during the years. The number of partners is 62, reflecting that some partners have dropped off whilst others have joined. The economic crisis has made it more difficult for institutions to have the time for ASFA although joining ASFA remains popular.

The topic of recruitment of new partners will be discussed by the groups on Tuesday, however the strategy could focus on strengthening the existing partnership rather than recruiting new partners. Mr Taconet (FAO) commented on the importance of retiring partners passing their work and experience on to new partners who can continue their responsibilities.

6.6.1 Potential partners

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the FAO Report (section 4.5.2, page 9), of the FAO Report (ASFA/2018/3) where a summary was provided of recruitment initiatives during the intersessional period.

**Turkey:** the FAO ASFA Secretariat is in contact with Turkey regarding signing the Partnership Agreement. Ms Kulakova (BO MTCA) commented on Turkey joining ASFA Partnership, she has worked with Central Fisheries Research Institute-Trabzon and said they might be able to recommend institutions from Romania, Georgia and Bulgaria.

**Myanmar:** FAO ASFA Secretariat was in contact with the Department of Fisheries (DOF) in Yangon a few years ago. Ms Wibley (former ASFA Editor-in-Chief) had some discussion regarding participating of the Fisheries Resource Centre (FRC) in LIFDC project, although the outcome is unknown. The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to make contact again with this institution.

**Bangladesh:** Mr Superio (SEAFDEC) reported that he contacted Khulna University in Bangladesh however, no response have been received.

**Sri Lanka:** Mr Superio (SEAFDEC) reported that he contacted National Aquatic Resources Research and Development Agency in Sri Lanka however, no response have been received is in contact.
**Maldives:** Mr Superio (SEAFDEC) reported that he contacted an institution in Maldives however, no response have been received.

**Cameroon, Latvia, and Malawi:** Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded that Ms Wibley (former ASFA Editor-in-Chief) discussed in 2015 the possibility of institutions from these countries joining ASFA. There was no follow-up with Cameroon during intersession. Ms Kalentsits said that institutions in Latvia and Malawi are currently in correspondence with the ASFA Secretariat regarding the titles they could monitor for ASFA.

**Germany:** Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the ASFA Secretariat is awaiting response from 3 institutions which were contacted in 2018 regarding their possible participation in ASFA. She also mentioned that The ASFA Secretariat issued a notice in EURASLIC newsletter, stating that it was open to expressions of interest from German institutions.

---

**Follow-up Action Item 18 from the 2016 Board Meeting:**

18. Regarding the possible recruitment of a new German National ASFA Partner to replace Johann Heinrich von Thunen-Institute (VTI) …. Mr Bahl (VTI) had recommended some possible institutes …. Konsortium Deutsche Meeresforschung (German Marine Research Consortium) …. Limnological Institute University of Konstanz… Leibnitz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries…

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to contact the above 3 institutes regarding their interest in joining the ASFA Partnership as a replacement for VTI as the National German ASFA Partner.

---

Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) suggested contacting Kiel University. Ms Kulakova (BO MTCA) commented that she presented ASFA at EURASLIC meeting in Bremen in 2017, participants expressed an interest in joining ASFA but had little time.

**Mr Pettman (FBA) agreed** to contact Ms Barbara Schmidt at Kiel University regarding the search for a new German National ASFA Partner.

---

**6.7 ASFA Partnership Agreement**

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3), Section 4.1, page 4. As of 1 June 2018, the ASFA Partnership Agreement (official title: Partnership Agreement Providing for Co-Operation in the Preparation and Publication of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) and the Reconstitution of the Advisory Board) has been signed by 62 Partners:

- 4 UN Co-sponsoring ASFA Partners
- 47 National ASFA Partners
- 10 International ASFA Partners
- 1 Publishing ASFA Partner

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to Section 4.1 of the FAO Report (ASFA/2018/3) which provided information regarding the ASFA Partnership Agreement. She explained that the Agreement defines the ‘responsibilities’ of the ASFA Partners and also the functions of the ASFA Advisory Board. All ASFA Partners signed the Partnership when joining the system. The text of the current ASFA Partnership Agreement was drafted in 1995 and has remained the same since, except for one amendment which was passed during the 2008-2009 intersessional period regarding the establishment of criteria for the removal of Partners not fulfilling their responsibilities. Details of this amendment are included in the FAO Report, Section 4.1, footnote 3 (ASFA/2018/3). Minor modification/additions or re-interpretation of points in the Agreement are usually made through discussion and “agreement” at the annual ASFA Advisory Board Meetings and are thus recorded as such in the Report of the Meeting.

---

**6.8 ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest**

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3), Section 3, page 3 and also the document ASFA/2018-Info1. The current Publishing agreement runs until December 2019 so there are 1.5 years to make any changes. Partners were asked to contact the FAO ASFA Secretariat with any changes they would like to see in the publishing agreement.
Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to ASFA/2018-Info1, which is an abridged version of the agreement: it describes the responsibilities of the Publisher as regards the production and distribution of the ASFA Information product, and it describes the entitlements that the publisher must grant to the ASFA Partners including the terms and conditions of usage of the set entitlements by ASFA partners. A new paragraph in the document refers to promotion of the database which should be made clearer in the Publishing Agreement. A meeting is proposed for early 2020 for ASFA Impact Evaluation Working Group and the Publisher to discuss strategic changes. Ms Kalentsits mentioned that marketing of the database on ProQuest appears limited, would like ProQuest to be more active in promotional activities and possibly for this to be reflected in the Publishing Agreement.

Mr Pettman (FBA) drew attention to ASFA/2018-Info-1 page 5, on the limited use of ASFA records in other products. This has implications for what will be discussed during the brainstorming sessions.

Mr Taconet (FAO) commented on the possible meeting with ProQuest and asked how will the decision for the meeting be made? Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said the decision on whether to have the meeting would be made at the end of this meeting in order to give enough time to prepare for a meeting if it is to take place. Mr Taconet commented that it would be useful to have expert advice from people who can think ‘outside the ASFA box’ at the meeting and invited partners to think if there is someone at their institution who could attend such a meeting. Mr Taconet also commented on whether the publishing could or should in the future allow a subset of the ASFA database to be made openly accessible, possibly on Google, as this would increase the visibility of ASFA.

The ASFA Secretariat agreed to liaise with ProQuest regarding the dates and place for the meeting which should be held in January-February 2019 and attended by representatives from FAO (the ASFA Secretariat, ProQuest and IEWG. Mr Taconet (FAO) will try to identify 1-2 high level managers in the ASFA partner institutions to join the meeting.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that an abridged version of the Publishing Agreement is available on the FAO Document Repository http://www.fao.org/3/a-an690e.pdf.

6.9 Entitlements (Partner entitlements to ASFA products as listed in above Agreements)

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the FAO Report, Section 8.6 (ASFA/2018/3) and also to the document ASFA/2016/Info-1, which is an abridged version of the ASFA Publishing Agreement.

As ProQuest no longer publishes printed journals, basic entitlements are now limited to internet access to database and CD-ROMs and/ or DVDs. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA partners that problems with access should be sent to Ms Paula McCoy (ProQuest) and not to the ASFA Secretariat. Detailed information regarding entitlements is contained in the publishing agreement.

6.10 ASFA Co-operation with other Groups/Initiatives/Systems/Meetings outside or related to ASFA

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda item, which covered ASFA Partner activities carried out in collaboration with other organizations. Section 11 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3) also covers this topic.

IAMSLIC

The ASFA Secretariat tries to participate in IAMSLIC conferences. Ms Wibley (former ASFA Editor-in-Chief) participated in the IAMSLIC Conference in 2016, and gave a presentation describing the ASFA Trust Fund digitization projects. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) hopes to attend the IAMSLIC meeting in Uganda in October 2018. She mentioned that IAMSLIC Conferences create a good opportunity for the ASFA Secretariat to organize training workshops and to meet up with (potential) ASFA partners. Ms Kalentsits also reported on the use of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay IAMSLIC membership fees for ASFA Partners. She went through the costs of joining IAMSLIC which is an ongoing ASFA Trust Fund project. ASFA covers IAMSLIC membership for 42 ASFA partners and many ASFA Partners play a key role in IAMSLIC. Ms Kalentsits reminded ASFA Partners that they can include IAMSLIC participation or networking related activities in their Partner Reports.
Ms Kalentsits mentioned about the lack of participation of ProQuest in IAMSLIC conferences. It could be a good opportunity for ProQuest to get feedback from customers.

OceanDocs

Ocean Docs conversion tool: The ASFA Secretariat is aware that the conversion tool does not currently work, however has decided it is best to await the outcome of the new software before fixing the problem.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) commented that some metadata fields for ASFA input might not be necessary, and it would be interesting to know whether all fields are used/required by end-users? Entering records manually takes time, and the new software could harvest Ocean Docs and Aquatic Commons to save time and create more records. Do we need ASFA software? Software has to be compatible with different operating systems.

Mr Pissierssens said that Google Scholar is used by a lot of researchers, could ASFA be present on Google Scholar? If we are looking to widen participation, where does ASFA want to be in the future? Will an A&I service still be relevant as most users want full text. One possibility would be to create an open access ASFA – it can be called differently and developed along with the commercial product.

Mr Pissierssens said that the ASFA products could be made available and marketed better. Products such as the ASFIS tools, could be made available as gazetteers or web services, which is common practice elsewhere. Other organisations market their information products better. Better marketing and availability of the ASFA Products would be an Information Service, as lots of places need lists of regions. ASFA could cooperate more by harvesting with IOC, there are new innovative ways of doing more with less.

7. IMPACT EVALUATION AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR ASFA

Mr Montes (UNAM) introduced the Impact Evaluation (IE), as Chair of the Impact Evaluation Working Group (IEWG) referring to the FAO Report (ASFA/2018/3) and the document ASFA/2018/Info-4. He mentioned that ASFA aims to be the top marine and aquatic sciences database, however the technological changes mean it is difficult to keep pace. An IE is therefore needed to assess how ASFA is currently performing and to make recommendations for the future. A Working Group has already been formed, although all ASFA partners are invited to participate. It is fundamental that partners make suggestions and bring ideas to secure successful future for ASFA.

Ms Anton (FAO ASFA Secretariat) then introduced the agenda for the rest of the day which focused on the IE and would be divided into two parts. The first part is a report of what the IE has been doing, the second is the development of the 3 year ASFA Workplan.

Presentation of the ASFA Impact Evaluation

Ms Anton (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the IEWG has come up with a draft plan which it wishes to finalise on Thursday so that the IE can move forward. She said that now is a challenging time for libraries and ASFA must keep pace with the rest of the world. All parts of ASFA will be assessed by the IE: products (including software); policies and strategies; communication and promotion; ASFA partnership.

Members of the IEWG were introduced to the group, and the proposed steps of the IE were presented:

- Diana Castillo study: Ms Castillo (Dalhousie University) is to present progress on her survey this afternoon.
- Competitor Analysis: Mr Pettman (FBA) is to compare ASFA with Google Scholar; the ASFA Secretariat is to compare ASFA with other A&I services; and would like other partners to volunteer to undertake similar studies.
- Surveys of end users/ non-users: Mr Pettman (FBA) is willing to undertake these surveys.
- Abstracting and Indexing in modern times: Mr Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) agreed to prepare discussion paper.
The ASFA Secretariat and Mr Pettman (FBA) agreed to design a survey assessing the usefulness of ASFA to end-users.

Mr Taconet (FAO) raised an issue of in-depth interviews being as important as collection of big data.

Ms Anton (FAO ASFA Secretariat) discussed the current and past benefits of ASFA. Partners were asked to write how ASFA has benefitted their institution on a post-it note and share it with the Board. These would later be shared and discussed with partners at the end of the week.

Ms Anton (FAO ASFA Secretariat) discussed the current and future impact of ASFA on its stakeholders. She suggested it would be good for ProQuest to be more involved in promoting ASFA and also discussed future products and developments for ASFA, for example harvesting repositories would be a good way to include more records on ASFA.

Ms Anton (FAO ASFA Secretariat) then discussed a wish list of changes and improvement for ASFA and presented a possible new business model.

Media, including Social Media

The importance of promoting ASFA on different media, particularly social media, was raised. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that ProQuest has an active social media presence and can help raise awareness of ASFA by retweeting. It was decided that a Promotions and Communications Working Group should be set up to better promote ASFA in the future.

Partners also voted to set up an ASFA Newsletter that would be distributed among partners and could be used to promote ASFA at their institution.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to set up a Promotions and Communications Working Group.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed to liaise with ProQuest’s social media team to assist promotion.

Discussion with Diana Castillo

Ms Diana Castillo (Dalhousie University) presented a summary of her project assessing the impact of ASFA – see document ASFA/2018/Info-11 (Briefing Note: A case study on the Use of the International Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts Database / by D.J Castillo, B.H. MacDonald, S.S. Soomai) for more information.

Mr Taconet gave an introduction to Ms Castillo’s project. FAO has had a relatively long collaboration with Dalhousie University; Mr Bertrum MacDonald (Dalhousie University) worked with Mr Richard Grainger (FAO) and has a letter of agreement to proceed with a valuation of SOFIA. A new project was discussed and the project selected was the ASFA impact evaluation. The first phase was discussed after the 2016 Board Meeting, it was agreed the project could be a long-standing initiative and take up to three years, organised in two phases. Diana will gather current views on ASFA and its current usefulness. FAO has two primary research questions:

- Does A&I have a place in marine research and policy research?
- Does ASFA meet information needs of its users or are there comparable information needs that do it better?

The project has included the following activities: 1) an analysis of customer use of ASFA (using data provided by ProQuest); 2) surveying ASFA subscribers; 3) series of interviews with IAMSLIC members.

Mr Taconet (FAO) asked what the next steps would be. Ms Castillo (Dalhousie University) said a case study with researchers would be the next step. So far, her work has focused on librarians, so a next step would be talking with researchers and getting a sense of what they’re using. An additional study that includes users would be informative, it is beyond the thesis capacity however. In part because it’s difficult to identify users. Mr Pettman (FBA) has some end users to survey and is interested in sharing Ms Castillo’s questionnaires and methodology, which Diana will provide as appendices to her report and she is happy to work with Ian Pettman in the future.
Mr Gaibor (INP) asked about survey size, Ms Castillo said the March survey went to around 250 people and had a 22% survey response rate. Ms Pacey (NAFO) asked when the thesis would be made available. Ms Castillo said it will be posted at the Dalhousie University repository, a summary will also be prepared and submitted to the board. Mr Taconet (FAO) asked whether there would be room for further collaboration on surveying users, as ASFA is going to start working groups that will reflect on different themes (four discussion groups are named). Ms Castillo said she would be happy to complement work undertaken by ASFA. Ms Castillo also presented a copy of a poster she presented at a conference in Canada.

8. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

8.1 www-ASFA-ISIS

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3), section 7, pp. 21-23. Also ASFA/2018/Info-3 and /Info3-a cover this section. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded partners if they come across problems using the software, to report them to the ASFA Secretariat.

8.2 Alternative software

Presentation of ASFA Software

Ms Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) presented the results of the Software and Internet Connectivity Survey and also possible options for new software. Mr Taconet (FAO) demonstrated the iMarine platform to partners. The presentation announced that Release 2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software was no longer being considered as an option, due to lack of ongoing support to maintain CDS-ISIS and difficulty in hiring a consultant to undertake the work. As alternative software, iMarine, Alma and a bespoke option from CIO were presented to the Board.

Mr Mathamparambil (NIO/NICMAS) asked whether DSpace or E-prints had been considered. Ms Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said the ASFA Secretariat would look into whether DSpace would be a viable option, however, using Open Source software would require someone to maintain, update and fix problems, which the ASFA Secretariat does not currently have.

Ms Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the ASFA Partners can be involved with the selection, testing and development of new software if they wish and it was agreed.

Ms Vicary agreed to distribute in two weeks’ time a summary of presentation and feedback gathered. A call for volunteers for development and testing phases to software to be included.

9. ASFA DATABASE: QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ASPECTS

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3), section 8.5 (ASFA/2018/3) and also in ASFA/2018-Info-paper 5. He mentioned that this section of the agenda was due to be covered on Tuesday 12 June however, was covered on Monday 11 June.

9.1 Number of records from database partners’ input logs

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the document ASFA/2018/70. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) announced there was an average of 15,000 records per year added to the ASFA database by ASFA partners.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented on the input for NOAA which is done by ProQuest. Ms McCoy said that they were very difficult to count as they are listed as miscellaneous documents and there is no reliable way of counting them. That is the reason for numbers not being accurate.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) asked why, if the amount of literature published and made available was increasing, why wasn’t input to the database? Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that ProQuest's input had increased, reflecting the increase in available literature, but that ASFA Partner input had not increased due to a number of factors. Harvesting records might therefore be a useful way of partners increasing their input and could also lead to dropped-off partners re-joining the ASFA partnership.
The ASFA Secretariat agreed to investigate possibility of a pilot project with a recently dropped off partner to discover whether harvesting records or a different partnership model would allow them to stay in the ASFA Partnership. A project team would be needed to take it forward.

9.2 Subject Scope of ASFA

9.2.1. Current ASFA Subject Scope and its Possible Expansion

Ms Kalentsits reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat contacted ASFA Partners via email however, not many responses were received. Nobody objected to removing subject category codes in new software.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO) said the issue of Subject Scope was discussed at the 2016 meeting where Mr Pettman (FBA) provided a brief summary: as partners are not currently able to expand the scope of ASFA, the issue of expanding the subject scope should not be re-examined until such a time when partners are able to meet the extra demand of increasing input that would occur if the subject scope was expanded. In 2016, Ms Wibley (former ASFA Editor-in-Chief) said that partners who struggle to assign subject category codes can use the general subject category codes. A decision was made to stop using subject category codes so this should no longer cause problems in the new software.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to remove the subject category codes in the new software.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) also commented on the subject scope of ASFA. The UN, after the Paris Agreement, has a number of sustainable development goals (SDGs): SDG 14 deals specifically with water. Under the SDGs, countries must submit a number of reports. These reports should be covered by ASFA.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that Mr Richard Pepe (ASFA Consultant) prepared a paper, ASFA 2015/info-3, which showed how ASFA currently covers these subject areas. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) added that a summary of Mr Pepe’s report is included in the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3).

Mr Pettman urged partners to cover material under SDG 14 that comes from their countries.

Ms Anton (FAO) asked whether partners had found new titles which expand the original scope of what is indexed. Mr Pettman (FBA) had suggested one new journal on aquatic law although ProQuest was unable to cover it.

Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) commented on the difficulty of knowing whether some material is relevant to ASFA or not. For example: coastal pollution, its impact on drinking water and resources.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said subject would vary from partner to partner and that if every partner is aware of the SDGs they can bring literature to the attention of ASFA Secretariat and see if it can be covered.

9.2.2. Coverage and Monitoring

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to Annex 2 on page 38 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3). Also ASFA/2018/70 cover this area.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the completeness of coverage is very important to ASFA and that partners should monitor publications in a complete and timely manner. Partners should cover not only serials but monographs and grey literature, as this is what makes database unique. Each partner
should maintain their Monitoring List (MONLIS) and ensure it is up to date. Partners were asked to inform Mr Vojar (FAO ASFA Secretariat) if there are changes to titles on their individual Monitoring Lists.

The ASFA Partners should ensure that they receive/are able to access the publications included in their monitoring lists. ASFA Secretariat reviewed the ASFA Monitoring List by liaising with ProQuest: 7513 titles are included in the ASFA Monitoring List, of which 3282 titles are active. Also included in the ASFA Monitoring List are other information – who covers the title, ISSN, abbreviated title etc. The last update of the ASFA Monitoring List was on 12 April 2018 and is available on the ASFA workspace so can be downloaded and replaced. The file can be downloaded in Text or Excel format.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the section 5.1.1 of the FAO Report, Maintenance of the Monitoring List master file: in 2016, Mr Vojar (FAO) contacted partners regarding gaps on their monitoring lists. A reminder was sent via Board-L to include information on efforts to cover gaps in partner reports. During the intersessional period some partners, like China and Mexico, liaised with the ASFA Secretariat regarding titles which could be transferred to ProQuest. Ms Kalentsits informed that the ASFA Secretariat uses ABCD software for maintaining the Monitoring List, this can be used by Partners if they wish.

There is also a ProQuest title list, begun in May 2018. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) requested the list from the people who work with metadata at ProQuest, the list is constantly updated. It is worth looking at ProQuest’s list to see what information can be provided, as this can be used for a homepage on ASFA to provide a complete list of titles on ASFA.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) asked about how to get rid of gaps that appear on the ASFA Monitoring List. Gaps on the Monitoring List can be caused by various reasons: sometimes lack of staff; when the serials cease publication; when serials are not received; when not all articles are relevant to the scope of ASFA. The main problem is that a huge number of journals in which scientists publish relevant articles are not covered in ASFA. Collaborative centres wish to submit one or two articles by authors which are relevant but not on their Monitoring List. The journals then stay on the Monitoring List although not completely processed and therefore gaps appear.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that Non-Core journals cover only the relevant articles, so this would resolve the issue for serials which do not always contain relevant articles.

Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) commented that she experienced the same problem. She resolved it by contacting Mr Vojar (FAO ASFA Secretariat) who added new titles to MONLIS as Non-Core titles, and she only inputs the relevant articles.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) said that she had done this, but there are still more journals that need to be added.

Mr Vojar (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented (via Facebook Live Streaming Chat) regarding gaps that if the publication has ceased, Partners must inform the ASFA Secretariat who will update the Monitoring List. For Non-core journals: in the ASFA Monitoring List we assume that not all the articles will be on ASFA so gaps are inevitable and not a problem. In order to index a few relevant articles published in non-core journals which are not on the ASFA Monitoring List, it is necessary to contact the ASFA Secretariat first, so that the journal title could be added to the Monitoring List. In the past, ASFA Partners had to monitor the whole journal, although this has changed. Each country is responsible for the journals published in their own country. Should ASFA Partners find an article published by authors from their country in one of journals monitored by another ASFA Partner, they should contact that partner and ask to index that particular article. Non-core serials can also be monitored for a temporary period – for example, just for one or two years. The current system is required by ProQuest which means that all the titles have to be included in the Monitoring List.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) stated that another option to avoid gaps was to ask ProQuest to monitor the journal.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) thanked Mr Vojar (FAO ASFA Secretariat) for providing solutions, and said she would write to him regarding these problems and request that some core titles be changed to non-core titles.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) summarised the discussion by saying that non-core journals is a solution for adding one or two articles from a title; coverage as a non-core journal for a temporary time is permissible; and that partners must inform the ASFA Secretariat when a publication ceases.
9.3 Grey Literature

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) introduced this agenda item commenting that grey literature was one of the most important aspects of ASFA as it makes the database unique. All partners should make efforts to cover grey literature in their countries. Many partners cover this aspect in their reports which is very useful: ADRIAMED, SEAFDEC, Japan, Mexico, Philippines, Senegal, Uganda and UK, all mention this. The ASFA Secretariat are working on ways to demonstrate that ASFA holds this unique information to a wider audience.

Trust Fund projects also add grey literature to the database. These projects are valuable, deposit information into digital repositories and ASFA records are created which link to full text. Trust Fund projects are reported on under a separate section.

Harvesting Records

The FAO Report, ASFA/2018/3, Section 8.5.3 page 28 covers harvesting repositories.

Follow-up Action Item 19 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

19. Regarding the harvesting of grey literature in the Aquatic Commons by ProQuest ….. records were only going to the ProQuest Full-text Database not ASFA……

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed to investigate the possibility of adding the records harvested by ProQuest from AC to the ASFA database. [Rapporteur's note: Ms McCoy (ProQuest) reported on the last day of the Meeting that she was hoping for a positive announcement following her request to the appropriate ProQuest team.]

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that ProQuest were able to harvest records from Aquatic Commons and export them to the ASFA database however there were a number of problems with the citations. This resulted in the ASFA Secretariat asking ProQuest to temporarily remove the records until a solution could be found. It is also important to consider duplicates, as many items on Aquatic Commons are already on ASFA.

At the 2016 Advisory Board Meeting, Mr Taconet (FAO) raised the issue of harvesting institutional repositories: this would enable records from dropped off partners to be harvested, e.g. NACA or ICES. As ProQuest are now able to cover local languages, research on this type of arrangement should be included in the Impact Evaluation. The new software should also be capable of harvesting records from repositories.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) asked how ASFA currently defines grey literature. Grey literature makes ASFA unique but it doesn’t seem there is a strategy, the numbers of grey literature documents mentioned are interesting but don’t say much by themselves – are they theses, reports, etc.? Are there categories of grey literature used on ASFA and is there strategy behind Trust Fund projects? Should partners who work with universities try to cover theses, based on number that are being published? ASFA could benefit from more a strategy in regards its coverage of grey literature.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said this was useful and interesting insight from Mr Pissierssens (IOC) and it should be discussed further. From looking at Partner reports, she said it would be possible to see what grey literature is being covered.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said that one of challenges that ASFA has is migrating titles: miscellaneous reports that are not on the ASFA Monitoring List. The solution was to create a number of generic titles: ASFA MONOGRAPHS and ASFA SERIALS. Ms McCoy has looked at what comes under the ASFA Monographs title, so far there are 790 reports, books, and miscellaneous documents. The name ASFA Monograph is not very descriptive, as all types of documents fall under this category. More could be done to catalogue different items as such, to ensure they are monitored.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that in the email sent to ProQuest Partners cover titles, this could be used to record or analyse types of ASFA records as a temporary solution. ASFA does have a definition of grey literature, this may need reconsidering. In terms of the UK, FBA has another Trust Fund bid, to record theses. Thanks to Open Access, theses are now much easier to record on ASFA and provide full text links. Mr Pettman mentioned that FBA is searching 64 university repositories and selecting relevant theses for
inclusion on ASFA. If the FBA proceeds with this next project, they will have caught up six years with theses that have been made available. These will now be a regular part of UK input to keep that up to date. Many have a three year embargo, so there may be a delay – not a gap as it’s an embargo on open access from the universities. This might just be a UK initiative, but the UK’s Environment Agency has gone through many organisational changes and so many publications have been taken off the website. They realised this was an error, FBA then digitised their reports. This may be a strange UK situation, but by keeping an eye on other organisations, having the visibility of ASFA can resurrect old publications.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) summarised the importance of grey literature and timeliness to the ASFA database. When depositing to Aquatic Commons, records go through approval processes, and Partners have to wait until records are approved.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) asked Ms McCoy (ProQuest), if there are 790 ASFA Monographs, how long does it take for them to go live on database? Serials are live right away for other titles, how long it takes to process monographs?

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) answered that they are processed in the same way as Serials and should go live straight away.

There followed some discussion regarding serial titles on the ASFA Monitoring List. Ms Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked whether serial titles could be recorded by grey literature category to record how much of each category ASFA partners were submitting.

Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) commented that she had sent a batch of records which were dissertations, and that these records are yet to appear on ProQuest. She asked whether anyone else had used the FTP site for dissertations or theses. Partners responded that they had sent dissertations to ProQuest and that they had appeared on the database as expected.

Mr Superio (SEAFDEC) commented that when submitting records entitled ASFA monograph, he had noticed the title of the Conference was missing from the record as displayed on the ProQuest platform. He stated that partners should check their records after they’ve been submitted to ProQuest to ensure they display correctly.

Regarding grey literature submission, one thing that prevents increase of grey literature in ASFA is that the majority of this literature is in non-English speaking countries and has no English abstract. These countries find it hard to write an abstract. Daryl Superio suggested creating templates for the abstracts of grey literature documents in non-English languages.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented on the automatic translation button on the ProQuest platform and asked whether a similar feature could be used on the new software. Ms Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) responded that she would enquire but that it was likely to be expensive.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that ProQuest can work with partners who struggle to create abstracts.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) said that editing abstracts can be more difficult than just translating them, and Google Translate is not recommended for creating abstracts for ASFA records.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to ask software developers whether an automatic translation button for the new software could be provided and also investigate standard templates for English abstracts.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed to look into what help ProQuest can provide.

9.4 Timeliness

This part of the agenda is covered in Section 8.5.2, page 27, of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3).

The good news is that ProQuest’s editorial platform makes records available to view more quickly. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded partners that they should not accumulate records but send them in small batches on a monthly basis.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that ProQuest’s automated indexing has been improved.
9.5 Accuracy of ASFA records appearing on database

There were two action items from the 2016 Annual Board meeting regarding accuracy of ASFA records appearing on the database:

Follow-up Action Item 21 and Action Item 22 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

21. Regarding the errors and discrepancies in ASFA records on the ProQuest platform that have been noted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat ………

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to liaise with Ms McCoy (ProQuest) regarding errors identified in ASFA records on the ProQuest platform, with a view to resolving some of the outstanding issues, providing examples of the various types of errors.

22. Regarding searching the database and identifying errors ….the FAO ASFA Secretariat always came across discrepancies when searching the database ….did ASFA Partners notice errors when searching the database ….who actively searched the database … for what purpose ….some to reply to user requests for information ….some to assist them in ASFA data entry/indexing ….

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to send an e-mail via ASFA Board-L to survey ASFA Partners regarding their usage of the ASFA database, e.g. did they do searches themselves? Did they notice any discrepancies?

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that as regards to action item 21, this is done on a daily basis and the ASFA Secretariat informs ProQuest and Ms Abram about the discrepancies it finds. Action Item 22 is still pending and will be undertaken at some point in the future. These points will be discussed on the fourth day, Ms Kalentsits reminded partners to report problems when they come across problems on the ASFA database.

9.6 ASFA inputting procedures

This section covers the new editorial platform by ProQuest and was introduced by Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat).

ASFA Partners are aware of the changes to the ProQuest editorial platform that took place between November 2017 – early 2018. ProQuest went through changes to its editorial platform, testing phases and decisions on file format the ASFA Partners should submit their records in? At first, XML format was preferred although problems with mapping fields occurred so it was decided to continue submitting records as .ISO files. As Ms McCoy (ProQuest) has mentioned, the generic title was created for items not on the Monitoring List. Creating more titles should be considered in order to make records more accurate.

ASFA Partners were provided with new instructions on adding non-serial records. Problems with special characters is only with the current ASFA input software which does not allow export of special characters so ASFA Partners will have to continue with html script whilst using the current software. The instructions for submitting records have been updated accordingly and are available from the website. There are guidelines for bibliographic data entry, it is not worth updating these until a decision on the new software is made.

There were no questions or comments relating to inputting procedures.

10. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

This section is covered in Section 8 of the FAO report, on page 24 onwards (ASFA/2018/3).

10.1 ASFA Journals

The section on ASFA Journals has a historical note. The printed journals have ceased and are not part of entitlements anymore.
10.2 ASFA CD/ DVD ROM

The ASFA CD-ROMS and/ or DVDs are one of the basic entitlements of being an ASFA Partner. They are not a commercial product and are produced only for ASFA partners. Producing the CDs/ DVDs is becoming more difficult as the size of the database grows.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the survey was carried out and the results of the survey presented on page 25, section 8.3 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3).

The ASFA Secretariat surveyed partners twice, the first time only 2 replies were received. A second survey was conducted in April 2018 and resulted in 18 replies. 5 partners are not interested in either DVDs or CDs; 10 partners are interested in DVDs only. Portugal would prefer only CDs; some partners said only that they were not interested in CDs but not whether they still wished to continue to receive the DVDs.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that it looked as if the need for CDs was decreasing, and asked whether Ms McCoy has a timeline for when a decision on how many CDs would be required.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) replied that ProQuest are currently in the process of producing the First Quarter 2018 CDs, so would need to know the exact numbers by mid-July in order for the Second Quarter CDs to be produced for the right number of partners. This includes the number of CDs FAO requires, which is believed to have decreased.

In the past ProQuest sent everyone both CDs and DVDs so it is hoped that in the future ASFA can be more specific on the numbers it needs of both as it is not useful for ProQuest to create discs that nobody needs.

Ms Sado (NIFFR) commented that her institution still required the DVD and CD as both were very useful to users.

Mr Phouthavong (LARReC) commented that his institution did not require the CD or DVD.

Ms Keita (DPM) said her institution requires only the DVD.

Ms Bazi (INRH) said her institution required CDs but not DVDs.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to survey ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L to see who was still receiving the ASFA CD-ROMs and ask whether they would prefer to receive the DVD instead.

10.3 Internet Database Service

Ms Kalentsits referred to a point made in the NOAA Partner report that more clarity is needed in the statistical reporting of the ProQuest platform. It’s unclear what this means, and Maria Kalentsits said she would investigate further with Mr Brian Voss (NOAA).

Ms Pacey (NAFO) has mentioned problems of how ASFA records are displayed on ProQuest. The 530 field in the ASFA input software, document report/ patent number. This does not seem to be mapped to ProQuest’s new editorial system. Ms Pacey currently enters this information in the Issue field, on page four of the ASFA input software. Apparently, year of publication is not always displayed properly either. Some of the older files are displayed with a number of errors. Ms Pacey had also noticed errors with how ASFA records are displayed on the discover layer Summon. DFO should contact Summons directly about these problems as the records are inputted correctly but there is a problem with the display on Summons.

Ms Kalentsits reminded partners to check records on ProQuest and alert them to any problems they notice. No partners reported problems they had noticed at this point.
Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that ProQuest was working to resolve problems with the display of records. The new editorial platform has solved some problems but editing the display of older records created in the old platform is not easy, and ProQuest has a lot of records in a lot of databases that have backed up with problems and need work. Ms McCoy was careful when mapping fields for ASFA, so Partners should let her know if fields are not displaying correctly, especially with document type.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented on Ms Pacey’s (NAFO) solution of putting the report number in the issue field. The Issue field will not accept all types of punctuation so this may be a problem with some report numbers.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) commented that DFO are very keen for the report number to display in the record and in the results page. She said she had not encountered a problem using different types of punctuation. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said she would talk to Ms Pacey separately about this issue as the report number should be appearing.

Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) had a suggestion for ProQuest search platform. In SCOPUS, users can search using a combination of Title AND Keywords AND Abstract. This option is given as a default on the search interface, whereas in ASFA it would have to be set up manually. Searching these three areas could be useful to many researchers. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said she would like the ASFA Partners to discuss whether they agree with Ms. Silvoni’s suggestion and would like to see this change on ASFA. ProQuest needs to see that customers want a change in order to invest in implementing it. Ms McCoy agreed to survey Partners on this.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed to survey ASFA partners and ask whether they would like to see more or different features on the advanced search on ProQuest platform. Specifically, Ms Silvoni asked for a search option that combined: Abstract AND Title AND Keywords.

Mr Pettman commented that there are a number of new search features on the new editorial platform, some of which he was unsure how to use and needed to ask Ms McCoy. He suggested some user training on ProQuest.

ProQuest, the ASFA Secretariat and any interested partners agreed to put together training session on searching the ASFA database on ProQuest.

10.4 New outputs and services

This section was partially covered by the discussion on the new software, and will be discussed in more details in the discussion groups.

10.5 Public Relations Activities and Marketing

Follow-up Action Item 25 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

25. Regarding the ASFA Brochure …. Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) asked whether it would be possible to have a new brochure …..different design…. Updated information … useful for promoting ASFA

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to investigate the possibility of preparing a new updated ASFA brochure.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that promotional materials were discussed yesterday as part of the Impact Evaluation, and would also be discussed by the discussion groups. Unfortunately, the new brochure has not been developed but the ASFA Secretariat are working on it. In addition to the brochure, the ASFA Secretariat has several other initiatives for promotion of ASFA: FAO ASFA Secretariat will have a booth at COFI (Committee of Fisheries) in July 2018; a bookmark is being finalised; the website is being updated. Would other partners like to share their promotional activities? This is part of a new strategy, the ASFA Secretariat would like to see more promotion of ASFA from partners, including ProQuest, and for ASFA to be more visible on their website.

Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) said her discussion group would comment on this the following day.
10.6 Document Delivery

Mr Superio (SEAFDEC) said that a tutorial on the step-by-step process of submitting an ILL is on the IAMSLIC website. Some partners are not using this service, they directly submit their requests to IAMSLIC discussion group without first checking the Z3950 catalogue.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners about the order of priority when submitting their ILL requests (first via IAMSLIC mailing list, then via ASFA Board-L as last resort).

Mr Superio (SEAFDEC/AQD) agreed to resend tutorial on submitting an ILL.

Ms Sado (NIFFR) commented that the process could be difficult when English is only language used, and Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) said when it was a hard to reach document it could be better to go directly to ASFA Member and not whole ASFA Board.

10.7 Distribution of ASFA Information Products and Services

FAO Report section 8.7 on page 30 (ASFA/2018/3) and also the 19th report on LIFDC project (ASFA/2018/68), cover this item.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that this information is included in the report on LIFDC project prepared by Mr Vojar (FAO ASFA Secretariat) there is a summary in the FAO report. The ASFA Secretariat surveyed the participants that were receiving the update on CDs, if they would like to receive the update on DVDs instead. All the nine CD receiving institutions agreed to receive the update on DVD only. Currently, a total of 38 participating institutions are mailed ASFA DVDs. The ASFA Advisory Board thanked Mr Vojar for preparing this report.

11. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this agenda item referring to the FAO Report, section 7.2 (ASFA/2018/3).

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that training activities are important for the ASFA Partnership, especially for new partners but also training can be useful for those partners that need a refresh. A large part of ASFA Secretariat’s responsibilities is training Partners. Some training activities are outsourced to ASFA Partners.

Follow-up Action Item 30 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

30. Regarding carrying out ASFA Training workshops back-to-back with IAMSLIC conferences …. Ms Kulakova (YugNIRO) commented on the 2017 EURASLIC Conference to be held in Germany in May …it would be a 3-day meeting …. Perhaps opportune to carry out an ASFA Training workshop…possibility of investigating a replacement for VTI, ex-German National ASFA Partner.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to liaise with the EURASLIC organizing committee regarding participants to determine the feasibility of carrying out an ASFA Training Workshop after the conference.

Unfortunately this did not take place as Ms Wibley (former ASFA Editor-in-Chief) was retiring. However, Ms Kulakova (BO MTCA) presented ASFA at the EURASLIC conference — so thanks go to her. The ASFA Secretariat should look at providing trainings at further EURASLIC conferences.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the ASFA Secretariat always tried to provide training at IAMSLIC conferences. If not a group training session then one-on-one training is provided. This did not happen last year, but this year, if approved, Ms Kalentsits will travel to Uganda and make a presentation. The ASFA Secretariat is planning a five-day training session for five participants in October this year back-
to-back with the IAMSLIC conference. The persons to be trained are new ASFA inputters in Tanzania, Mozambique; Mauritania and Namibia; also Ms Keita from DPM, Senegal was invited to participate in this training, so that she can act as a trainer for new French speaking ASFA partners in the future.

Ms Kalentsits mentioned that Ms Bazi's (INRH) training, which was due to be conducted by Ms Messaoudi (INSTM), had to be postponed due to administrative arrangement but will hopefully this will be re-arranged shortly.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that should a new ASFA input software be developed, the ASFA Secretariat will coordinate preparation of the new ASFA Training tutorials.

Mr Superio (SEAFDEC/AQD) stated that there will be an IODE training course in Malaysia in December 2018 which he will attend as a Resource Person. This is an opportunity for Asian countries to receive ASFA training, or for collaborating centres. Mr Superio would be willing to conduct a training for Chulalongo University should there be a need for.

Ms Keita (DPM) said that it was always difficult to find time for training, and that as Ms Bazi (INRH) was attending the IAMSLIC Conference in Uganda later this year, could training not be provided there? Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said she would have to look at whether it’s possible to train six instead of five.

Ms Kulakova (BO MTCA) said she had received a letter from the new Ukranian National Partner. The new person responsible for ASFA in Ukraine is currently in China, but Ms Kulakova wanted to know whether she could be placed in line for future training? Ms Kulakova would be able to provide a training however, the best way forward should be agreed with the ASFA Secretariat.

Mr Mathamparambil (CSIR/NIO) asked what remote training facilities the FAO ASFA Secretariat has and whether it is possible to connect to Partners' computers or networks, this would be particularly useful given the problems with the current software the partners encounter. Ms Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) responded that she was not aware of any service that would allow the FAO ASFA Secretariat to connect to an outside network/ control your computer, but that this could be investigated.

Ms Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) agreed to investigate whether it is possible to connect to other institutions network/computers remotely and assist with software problems.

12. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

This part of the agenda is covered in section 5 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3). Also useful to consult are ASFA/2018/Info-7 from ProQuest on Geographic Terms; and ASFA/2018/Info-8 on Taxonomic Terms.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded the ASFA Partners that the ASFIS Reference Series publications were the tools and guidelines that assisted in ASFA input preparation. There are currently sixteen reference series publications.

ASFIS-1: Serials Monitored for the ASFIS Bibliographic Database

This Agenda Item is covered in section 5.1 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3). Ms Kalentsits said that it is important to keep the Monitoring List up to date. She mentioned that Mr Vojar (FAO ASFA Secretariat) is responsible for maintenance of the Monitoring List. The latest update is available on the ASFA Workspace.

**Follow-up Action Item 34 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:**

34. Regarding the exercise being carried out by the FAO ASFA Secretariat … checking the Monitoring List for gaps in coverage … individual lists of the ASFA Partners are being revised/checked by the FAO ASFA Secretariat … gaps in coverage are indicated …

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to send an e-mail to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L to remind ASFA Partners to check the gaps (if any) indicated in their monitoring lists and try to cover the missing issues. [A brief report of efforts made to cover the gaps and prepare ASFA records for the missing issues should be included in the Intersessional Reports.]

This has been reported under the ASFA coverage section.
Follow-up Action Item 32 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

32. Regarding the serial titles covered by NMDIS (China). Mr Yang Ying (NMDIS) said that out of the 40 or so titles included on their monitoring list ... due to lack of human resources ... NMDIS only able to cover around 15 of the 40 titles ... perhaps some could be transferred to ProQuest ...

Mr Yang Ying (NMDIS) agreed to liaise with the FAO ASFA Secretariat and ProQuest to determine which (if any) serial titles currently under their responsibility could be transferred to ProQuest.

This has now been resolved.

**ASFIS-2: Subject categories and scope descriptors**

This Agenda Item is covered in section 5.2 of the FAO Report (ASFA/2018/3).

Follow-up Action Item 35 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

35. Regarding the subject category codes ... they were important for the printed ASFA journals ... maybe not essential for the online database ... Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that ProQuest was no longer including them in records on their other databases ... users did not use the subject category codes for searching purposes ... therefore, perhaps they are not necessary ... Not having to select subject category codes would simplify indexing procedures ...

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to send an e-mail to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L to ask if anyone would object to not having to allocate subject category codes anymore to ASFA records. Should anyone object, a justification should be provided.

This has been actioned and it was decided to no longer use the subject category codes. [See Section 9.2.1 of this document for an Action Item]

**ASFIS-3: Guidelines for Bibliographic Description**

Covered in Section 5.3 of the FAO Report (ASFA/2018/3). These guidelines are used in preparation of ASFA records. Development of this tool is pending the selection of new software.

**ASFIS-4: Guidelines for Abstracting**

Covered in Section 5.4 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3). These guidelines have not been updated during the intersessional period, however the new software will require changes to this tool.

**ASFIS-5: Guidelines for Indexing**

Covered in Section 5.5 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3).

A working group has made changes to the rules of entering Geographic terms, Mr Pettman (FBA) has revised the guidelines for geographic indexing. It would be good to publish these rules now as it will save constructing strings that do not fit the new system. The priority should be to produce new guideline notes before producing a new GAL.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to publish new guidelines for geo-indexing, to be made available electronically to all partners.

**ASFIS-6: Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus**

Covered in section 5.6 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3).

During the intersessional period, the FBA undertook alterations to relationships requested by the Thesaurus Working Group. The FBA then produced revised versions of all these tools in the requested formats.
The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to publish the master file for the printed version of the Thesaurus.

Follow-up Action Item 36 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

36. Regarding future updates of the ASFA Thesaurus …. Mr Pettman suggested another ASFA Partner be involved with FBA so as to ensure continuity in future work on the ASFA Thesaurus , i.e. more than one ASFA Partner ….. Mr Pettman would eventually be transferring his responsibility to the new ASFA contact person at FBA Pettman agreed to liaise with other members of Thesaurus working group to ensure continuity of skills and maintenance of Thesaurus.

Mr Pettman (FBA) agreed to liaise with other members of the ASFA Thesaurus Working Group (FAO, ProQuest, IFREMER, INIDEP, SEAFDEC/AQD, FBA) to determine the next steps forward regarding future updates of the ASFA Thesaurus and also to see who (of the working group) would be prepared to continue and perhaps take the lead in future activities.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that a large part of this has not been done. He is concerned that the only person who has the software and knowledge of how it works, and some of the knowledge of building vocabularies, is himself. Subsequently he would like to see more partners trained.

Mr Pettman (FBA) mentioned that, there is a presentation tomorrow on possible ways forward for all the descriptor tools because they all need more people working on them. Mr Pettman requested that the existing members of the Geographic and Taxonomic groups have a short meeting at the hotel tonight in relation to the future of these services.

Follow-up Action Item 36 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

37. Regarding the usefulness of the translation of terms included in the ASFA Thesaurus term …..they could be of use to other ASFA Partners …. Could be posted on the FAO reserved ASFA ftp site….

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) and Ms Levashova (VNIRO) agreed to provide the FAO ASFA Secretariat with a list of the Thesaurus terms that they had translated so far.

This has been actioned, and is now available on the ASFA Working Space. Ms Levashova (VNIRO) commented that she used a number of scientific dictionaries to translate English terms to Russian. This is very difficult and time consuming. Terms are given in alphabetic order. She has prepared the next batch of terms and asked what should be done with them? Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) requested Ms Levashova to send the FAO ASFA Secretariat the updated file, this will replace the one currently on the ASFA Working Space.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) and Ms Kalentsits (FAO) agreed to liaise on updating Russian-English set of subject terms.

Ms Bazi (INRH) also commented on this topic saying she had a list of terms that she would like posting on the ASFA Workspace.

Ms Bazi (INRH) agreed to send list of subject terms she has, to be posted on the FAO ASFA Workspace.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) asked how new terms could be recommended. Mr Pettman (FBA) replied that in theory there is a form you can fill out, it can be found on one of the last page of ASFIS-6 Series. This can be added to the ASFA website. Using the form can be awkward though so the terms can be sent directly to the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Paula McCoy (ProQuest) said that the last update was in 2017, and thanked everyone who worked on the project.

ASFIS-7: Geographic Authority List

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the FAO Report, Section 5.7 (ASFA/2018/3).
Mr Pettman (FBA) referred to two discussion papers on this topic prepared to this meeting (ASFA/2018/Info-4 and ASFA/2018/Info-5). He mentioned that the meeting tonight will look at this action item.

Mr Petmann (FBA) reported on current status of GAL and on past and future work, referring to the FAO Report, Sections 5.7.1 and 5.7.2. He said that the Geographic Thesaurus was presented at 2009 meeting and it was deemed not to be a priority. This decision has not changed and is not likely to change in near future.

ASFIS-10: Authority List for Corporate Names

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the FAO Report, Section 5.10 (ASFA/2018/3). Ms Kalentcits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded Partners that they should send new corporate names to ProQuest so that they can keep their list updated.

ASFIS-15: ASFIS list of species for statistical purposes

Mr Pettman (FBA) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the FAO Report, Section 5.15 (ASFA/2018/3). This is normally updated once a year. The last update was in May 2018. This list cannot be imported into the ASFA software.

This was done to get the files ready for Release 2 of the input software. For the taxonomic list, 12,600 species from the FBA list were added. Due to the large number of terms on the ProQuest taxonomic list, it was not possible to add these in the time available. The list has therefore expanded from 12,600 species to 34,000 species. This is still not a comprehensive list, although it is much improved.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) stated that the lists are now maintained in synaptic thesaurus management. Taxonomic terms are now automated with the new software. There are some problems with non-preferred automated terms because they’re also common names. There are also some redundant terms. Ms Abram (ProQuest) has worked to manage this, quality is improving as it’s now easier to review.

ASFIS-16: Help Notes contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA Software (used for bibliographic description and data entry)

Covered in Section 5.16 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3). Help Notes contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA Software used for input. Update of this tool is pending decision on the new software.
13. ASFA Trust Fund

This topic is covered under section 6 of the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3).

The Publisher ProQuest is now the major and only contributor to the ASFA Trust Fund. A few years ago, yearly contributions were around $200,000, now they are half that. The FAO ASFA Secretariat spends funds on Trust Fund proposals. These are proposals to maintain and improve the system.

13.1 Status of the Trust Fund

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that in 2016, ASFA received payment of $145,137.80 from ProQuest. Payment for 2017 was received in May 2018 and was $106,736.92. Decreasing royalties is a serious concern to ASFA. Ms Anton (FAO) presented a new expenditure model for the ASFA Trust Fund (See XXXX). Ms Anton stated that expenditure must not greatly outpace income, and that with Royalties decreasing year on year greater scrutiny of ASFA Trust Fund spending was required.

At present, if Royalties continue to decrease and spending remains the same, the ASFA Trust Fund would end in six years. Therefore, two models are proposed:

- Emphasis of trust fund projects and training, OR
- Emphasis on Advisory Meetings, would mean less money available for Trust Fund projects

The ASFA Secretariat has proposed to allocate $160,000 spending for next intersessional period. The ASFA partners were invited to think about areas they would be comfortable reducing expenditure on.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) outlined a proposal to only accept Trust Fund proposals annually, rather than continuously throughout the year. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) queried what an ASFA financial year was, this needs to be decided. Ms McCoy also said that the biggest priority is the software, and expenditure on this should be prioritised.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that ASFA Trust Fund proposals are important, and that grey literature adds value to the database.

Mr Montes (UNAM) pointed out that more training will be required in the future because of the new software, so expenditure on training should not be limited.

Ms Anton (FAO) said that expenditure on the software is outside the annual budget she has presented.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that the ASFA Trust Fund will slowly disappear if nothing changes although there was no need to panic. He recommended agreeing priorities for annual spend from now on and review at board meetings. Priorities for UK Partner will always be those that improve the product and benefit the end user.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) said more work should be done to find out why the royalties are declining and if this is expected to continue. What can be done to change the decline? Improvements to the product? Is it that customers no longer have the money for the product? The end of ASFA as a commercial product does not mean end of ASFA. The UN requirement for countries to report on sustainability goals could provide funding opportunities for ASFA. Other funding can be found for training. Similar for Trust Fund projects, if there’s another need for the product can look for external funding. A number of these things should be investigated for the next meeting. There are many discussions yet to come. Actions will depend on the further discussions.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat, IOC, and ProQuest agreed to discuss projections for future income (i.e. royalties from ProQuest). An initial draft report will be prepared and presented to the Board. This report may result in changes future expenditure.

13.2 Proposals completed, in progress, pending further discussion and status of some proposals

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the FAO Report (ASFA/2018/3), Section 6.
13.2.2 Financial support to attend the 2016 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (CIS, Viet Nam)

The following 23 ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting: INIDEP (Argentina), IFOP (Chile), CIP (Cuba), INP (Ecuador), IREMER (France), NIO (India), IFRO (Iran), KMFFRI (Kenya), UNAM (Mexico), LARRReC (Laos), UNAM (Mexico), INRH (Morocco), NIFFR (Nigeria), IMARPE (Peru), UPV (Philippines), PIMRIS, VNIRO (Russia), SEAFDEC/AQD, DPM (Senegal), INSTM (Tunisia), NaFFIRI (Uganda), FBA (UK), YugNIRO (Ukraine).

The Funds available for this Meeting were $115,458, as follows: $70,000 was allocated as agreed at the 2015 Board Meeting and, in addition, $45,458 was carried over from the allocation for the 2015 Meeting.

The total amount disbursed was US$ 62,576. Thus the carry over to be added to 2016 allocation is (US$115,458– US$62,576) US$ 52,882

13.2.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 1 year Jan 2016 – Dec 2016)

This proposal was to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat by funding some of the work/initiatives that it carries out for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. This proposal covered January - December 2016. US$ 100,000 was allocated at the 2015 Board Meeting for this proposal for Jan-Dec 2016, plus there was a carry-over from the 2015 allocation of US$ 89,980 for a total of US$ 189,980 available funds.

For period January to December 2016, US$ 32,722 was spent. See, Part-3, item-6 of ASFA/2018/69, to get an idea how the FAO Secretariat utilized the allotment. The under spending during 2016 (US$157,238) was carried forward to the 2017 allotment.

13.2.3 Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (2016, CIS, Viet Nam) (US$2,500)

This financial incentive was intended to assist CIS/Viet Nam in organizing/hosting the 2016 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting.

13.2.4 UPV, ASFA Training for Collaborating Centres in Philippines ($5,540 originally) (US$5,810 after re-formulation)

This proposal was approved by the Board after clarification was provided regarding the approximate number of ASFA records that would be forthcoming following the recruitment of the Collaborating Centres. This proposal aims to recruit 8 Philippine Collaborating Centres and train their librarians in ASFA input methodology. The approximate number of ASFA records that would be forthcoming from the Philippines following recruitment of the Collaborating Centres is 2000.

13.2.5 IFRO Digitization & Indexing in ASFA of Iranian PhD theses (US$8,500 originally, US$5,400 after reformulation) (original title before reformulation of proposal was: Digitization and indexing of IFRO publications 1988-1998)

Initially, the ASFA Board, at the 2015 Board Meeting, did not approve this proposal and suggested that it be re-written (reformulated) to contain more details regarding the types of documents involved, including also a statement that the PDFs of the scanned material would be deposited in an open access repository such as OceanDocs. The proposal was reformulated and circulated for voting (approval) via ASFA-Board-L during the 2015-2016 intersessional period. It was approved.

This proposal intends to digitize and deposit PhD theses from Islamic Azad University (IAU) into the Aquatic Commons (AC) repository. The proposal includes more than 250 theses dealing with various aspects of aquatic sciences (aquaculture, ecology, plant and animal aquatic biology, pollution, fish diseases, biotechnology, genetic, fisheries, aquatic systematic, processing products etc.) from most regions of the former IRAN. The earliest publication date is 1997.

13.2.6 FBA Digitisation, Open Access Deposition, and ASFA Record Preparation of Further Freshwater Grey Literature (United Kingdom Environment Agency) (US$26 964)

This proposal aims to raise the awareness of and make freely available a further range of freshwater grey
literature from the UK Environment Agency (or written on behalf of the Agency). It would enable 1,000 grey literature records to be added to ASFA, complete with links to a freely available full text version in an Open Access repository. This proposal is a continuation of the proposal ASFA/2013/67a completed in June 2015 and will complete the records for all the useful reports from both these organizations that are available at this time.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal for the digitization, open access deposition and ASFA record preparation of UK Environmental Agency freshwater grey literature.

13.2.7  FBA ASFA record preparation for approximately 1,000 open access UK University PhD and MSc Theses relating to Aquaculture, Fisheries and other ASFA relevant topics from 1969 to 2010 ($23,520)

This proposal was submitted and approved during the 2016-2018 intersessional period via ASFA-Board-L.

The proposal aims to raise the awareness of and make freely available a large range of aquatic grey literature from the UK University sector, mainly PhD theses on aquaculture and marine, brackish water and freshwater biology, chemistry and physical aspects. These theses were previously restricted to very small audiences, usually in the Library of the respective University. Some were available in electronic form but usually only for a fee. This proposal would enable around 1,000 grey literature records to be added to ASFA, complete with links to freely available full text versions on Open Access repositories.

13.2.8  FAO Digitization and Open Access Deposition of Grey Literature held in the FAO Library from Selected Developing Countries (1923 onwards) and from FAO Fisheries Field Project Documents ($21,480)

This proposal aims to: 1) scan documents produced from 1923 onward by Fisheries Research Institutions located in developing countries (e.g. Sri Lanka and Morocco), upload the digitized documents in Aquatic Commons and provide ProQuest with the URL links for those documents already cited in ASFA; and, 2) scan documents produced within FAO regional and country field projects focused on aquatic pollution, legislation, fisheries development, covering various geographical areas such as South China Sea, South Pacific and West Africa, upload the digitized documents in the FDR, and provide ProQuest with the URL links for those documents already cited on the ASFA Database.

Pending ASFA Trust Fund Proposals

13.2.9  Adapting WWW-ISIS-ASFA to the re-engineered www-ISIS core program (including modifications to www-ISIS-ASFA, making it Release-2) (US$ 21,000)

This project is no longer relevant as an alternative software is being sought.

In-progress ASFA Trust Fund Proposals

13.2.10  Financial support to attend (this) 2018 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (UNESCO/IoC Project Office for IODE, Belgium)

This proposal remains classified as "in progress" until the participants have returned home from the Meeting and have presented any eventual Travel Expense Claims (TECs).

At this writing, the following 28 ASFA Partners will tentatively receive full or partial assistance to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: INIDEp (Argentina), IO/USP (Brazil), NMDIS (China), CIP (Cuba), INP (Ecuador), EMI (Estonia), IREMER (France), CSIR-NIO (India), PDII-LIPI (Indonesia), IFSRI (Iran), KMFRI (Kenya), LARRReC (Laos), UMT (Malaysia), IMROP (Mauritania), UNAM (Mexico), INRh (Morocco), NIFFR (Nigeria), IMARPE (Peru), UPV (Philippines), NMFRi (Poland), VNIRO (Russia), SEAFDEC/AQD, DPM (Senegal), NaFFIRI (Uganda), FBA (UK), BO MTCa (Ukraine), IIP (Uruguay), CiS (Viet Nam).

The Funds available for this 2018 Meeting were $102,882, as follows: $50,000 was allocated as agreed at the 2016 Board Meeting and, in addition, $52,882 was carried over from the allocation for the 2016 Meeting.
The total amount disbursed is not available at this writing as all itineraries/tickets have not been finalized, not to mention last minute cancellations. In any case, the estimated expenditure to date is $87,000. As usual over/under spending will be subtracted/added to next year’s (2019) allocation.

13.2.11 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 1 year Jan 2017 – Dec 2017)

This proposal was to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat by funding some of the work/initiatives that it carries out for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. This proposal covered January - December 2017. US$ 0 was allocated at the 2016 Board Meeting for this proposal for Jan-Dec 2017, plus there was a carry-over from the 2016 allocation of US$ 157,238 for a total of US$ 157,078 available funds.

For period January to December 2017, US$25,967 was spent. See, Part-3, item-1 of ASFA/2018/65, to get an idea how the FAO Secretariat utilized the allotment. The under spending during 2017 (US$131,271) was carried forward to the 2018 allotment.

No proposal submitted for 2018 (Staff support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2018) as carryover funds from the previous year ($131,271) are still sufficient to support the ASFA Secretariat activities in 2018.

To date for period January to April 2018, $17 017 has been spent/committed. See, Part-3, item-1 of this document below, to get an idea how the FAO Secretariat has so far utilized the allotment. Under or overspending during this period will be carried forward or subtracted from the eventual 2019 allotment.

13.2.12 Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (2018, UNESCO/IOC Project Office for IODE, Belgium)

This project provides a US$2,500 financial incentive to UNESCO/IOC Project Office for IODE, Belgium, to assist it in organizing/hosting the 2018 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting.

13.2.13 KMFRI Preparation of ASFA records for literature from non-ASFA Partner countries in Africa (US$11,895)

This proposal to prepare ASFA bibliographic records for literature from non-ASFA Partner countries in Africa and the SWIO region was approved by the ASFA Board. Implementation delays due to technical issues. The end-day of LOA was extended until 30 June 2018.

This proposal aims to prepare approximately 1800 ASFA records for literature from non-ASFA Partner countries in Africa (Zambia, South Africa, Sudan, Ethiopia, and Malawi) and the South Western Indian Ocean (SWIO) region and submit them to ProQuest for inclusion in the ASFA database. The publications involved include conference proceedings and technical reports, available in the KMFRI library and cover both marine and freshwater environments.

This project has been extended. Mr James Macharia (KMFRI) reported that most of the records have been covered, identifying of material and creation of records. The requirement by ProQuest that the list of titles has to be sent to Mr Vojar (FAO) has slowed down progress. Mr Macharia requested an extension as he will need an extra 2-3 months to do the work. The FAO ASFA Secretariat will have to see whether an extension is possible and would like to see 10-20 records for quality control.

13.2.14 NIFFR Filling the gap (614 records from FISON proceedings 2006-2013) (US$8,400)

This proposal was approved by the Board after clarification was provided as to whether the proposal also involved ASFA record preparation in addition to the digitization and disposition in the Aquatic Commons (AC) repository. Implementation delays due to technical issues. The end-day of LOA was extended until 31 December 2018.

This project aims to digitize and include in the AC repository about 614 records from the Fisheries Society of Nigeria (FISON) proceedings. This grey literature is considered important for promoting fisheries development, fisheries research, food security and human capacity development. The metadata of these publications has already (at an earlier date) been entered into ASFA database by NIFFR. FISON has granted permission to NIFFR to digitize the proceedings from 2006 to 2013.
Ms Sado (NIFFR) provided a summary of the proposal. The start of the project was delayed, however 626
documents were digitized and deposited into Aquatic Commons. The project is now complete, awaiting final
payment.

13.2.15 CIS Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries Technology and Scientific Research Results from 1995-2015,
deposition in CIS open access repository and preparation of ASFA records with full text links
(US$14,560)

The proposal was reformulated and circulated for voting (approval) via ASFA-Board-L during the 2016-
2018 intersessional period. It was approved.

This ASFA Trust Fund Project Proposal will involve the scanning of approximately 45,000 pages from
conference proceedings and periodicals (about 350 documents) which are available in hard copy in the CIS
library and depositing them in the CIS document repository (which will be open access).

In addition, since ASFA records have already been entered in the ASFA database for some of the above
documents (since 2004), ProQuest will be provided with the full text links so that the existing ASFA records
may be updated. For the remaining material, new bibliographic ASFA records will be created with the full
text links and submitted to ProQuest for inclusion in the ASFA database (about 650 new ASFA records).

Ms. Vu (CIS) reported that the project is complete and the final report has been sent to the FAO ASFA
Secretariat (13 May 2018), ahead of schedule.

13.3 New ASFA Trust Fund Proposals

This Agenda Item is covered in the FAO report (ASFA/2018/3), section 6.4.

13.3.1 FAO Trust Fund Proposal “Financial support to attend the next (2019) ASFA Advisory Board
Meeting (ASFA/2018/69) (US$50 000)

This is an ongoing proposal that is reviewed and renewed each year by the Board to update the amount of
funds allocated to attend the Meeting.

For the 2019 Meeting, the ASFA Secretariat will be requesting the sum of US$50 000.

The ASFA Advisory Board approved the proposal to fund the attendance of ASFA Partners at the 2019
ASFA Board Meeting

13.3.2 Financial support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2019)

This is also an ongoing proposal that is reviewed and renewed each year by the Board to update the amount of
funds allocated to the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

For this renewal cycle (i.e. for the year 2019) the FAO ASFA Secretariat will NOT be requesting funds. The
reason is that there has been a considerable carry-over for the last few years due to underspending and
FAO covering the costs of some activities using its own regular programme funds.

13.3.3 SEAFDEC/AQD Digitisation, Open Access Deposition and the provision of URLs to existing ASFA
records of the Conference Proceedings published by SEAFDEC Secretariat, Training Department
(TD), Marine Fisheries Research Department (MFRD), Marine Fishery Resources Development and
Management Department (MFRDMD) and Aquaculture Department (AD) (US$18 466)

This proposal aims to digitise and make available the full text of no less than 850 documents, mainly
SEAFDEC conference proceedings. Documents will be deposited on an Open Access repository and ASFA
records with links to the full text will be created. If records already exist on ASFA, then URLs will be added.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal for digitisation, Open Access deposition and the provision of
URLs to existing ASFA records of the conference proceedings published by SEAFDEC Secretariat, Training
Department (TD), Marine Fisheries Research Department (MFRD), Marine Fishery Resources
Development and Management Department (MFRDMD) and Aquaculture Department (AD).
This proposal is a continuation of the completed project. The proposal aims to raise the awareness of and make freely available a large range of aquatic grey literature from the UK University sector, mainly PhD theses on aquaculture and marine, brackish water and freshwater biology, chemistry and physical aspects. This project would complete the historical record preparation for UK PhD theses available as open access documents for the stated period. Records for UK PhD theses dated later will then be prepared by the ASFA UK partner as regular input.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal for ASFA Record Preparation for a further approximately 1,000 UK University PhD and MSc Theses relating to Aquaculture, Fisheries and other ASFA relevant topics from 1965 to 2010 now available as Open Access documents.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) enquired whether there is a document or guidelines for how to apply for the Trust Fund funding. Ms Kalentsits replied that it was on her to do list but unfortunately not possible to complete prior to the Board Meeting.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to prepare guidelines on how to submit Trust Fund proposals.

14. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) stated that her ProQuest Report ASFA/2018/64 contained an error she was only made aware of on Monday 11th June, regarding ASFA customer numbers. The academic markets are the biggest in all categories, the ASFA database in domestic markets in 2017 had 41 customers, in 2018 - 32. This is not surprising as a new customer will not buy ASFA as a standalone product. The Earth Aquatic and Atmospheric collection, went from 21 to 38, that rise was in the academic category. Overall in the domestic market numbers are up from 149 to 173 unique account names.

Internationally, sales overall went up from 207 to 237 customers. Most of those have the SciTech Premium Collection. ASFA sales as a standalone product went down from 46 to 44. But the Earth, Aquatic and Atmospheric Collection sales went up from 61 to 66.

The grand total of worldwide customers to all databases is up from 336 to 410. Ms McCoy will see if she can share the updated spreadsheet with ASFA partners.

Results of the survey conducted by Mr Pissierssens:

1 – Has your input (records) as an ASFA partner increased or decreased during the past 3 years? There was much variation between answers

2- Has the use of ASFA in your institution increased or decreased during the past three years? ASFA usage remains the same

3- Would it be possible for you to use a fully online (web-based) input method for submission of records? 24% of Partners would be unable to use web-based software

4- Should the metadata (field) structure of ASFA be made smaller? 90% of respondents wish to reduce metadata fields

5- Do you have an in-house document repository? 60% of respondents have in-house repository

6- If you answered ‘Yes’ to the previous question then what software is used? The Majority use DSpace.

7- If you answered ‘Yes’ to question 5 then would you be willing to have your repository harvested by ASFA? Majority of ASFA Partners would be happy for their repositories to be harvested

8- Can you list the three most useful products/services which ASFA provides? A range of answers were given to this question, including grey literature and full text.
9- Can you list one of two persons which you think can feed strategic thinking for the future of ASFA? This question received a mixed response.

10 – Your three ideas to make ASFA more visible - Lots of ideas were received in response to this question.

15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

A place and date for next meeting was discussed. Mr Zuraimi (UMT) said UMT (Malaysia) would consider hosting the meeting. Mr Montes (UNAM) said he would also enquire about whether UNAM (Mexico) could host the meeting, although he foresaw difficulties in it doing so. Ms Tiivel (EMI) has also agreed to investigate the possibility of hosting 2019 or 2020 ASFA Board meeting in Estonia.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up with Mr Zuraimi (UMT), Mr Montes (UNAM) and Ms Tiivel (EMI) regarding hosting the 2019 ASFA Board meeting.

Thursday 14th June

16. SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOP DAY

16.1 Impact Evaluation: Brainstorming Session (work in groups)

ASFA Products Group:
1. Alexis Pacey (NAFO) - Chair
2. Jacqueline Prod’homme (IFREMER)
3. Andrea Cristiani (IIP)
4. James Macharia (KMFRI)
5. Masayuki Noguchi (FRA)
6. Veronica Sado (NIFFR)
7. Shala Jamili (IFSRI)
8. Bouchra Bazi (INRH)

Ms Pacey (NOAA) presented the table (see Annex 3).

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that deduplication would be an important stage of harvesting records. Mr Pettman (FBA) suggested a pilot project to harvest the records of a recently dropped partner, such as NACA or ICES.

Mr Pettman also commented on:
- the Thesaurus – the group had discussed whether environmental regimes was still necessary.
- Datasets – Mr Pettman (FBA) created six ASFA records for datasets. It is possible to add it with the existing fields and it is still a reasonable record. Mr Pettman could write how it could be done.
- Maps – that would have to be done within an iMarine platform, not on ProQuest.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) said that the outcomes of the survey showed that one third of partners are using DSpace, others are using Ocean Docs. His suggestion is to look at DSpace which would avoid double entry. He also suggested that a consolidated document for the vision for ASFA’s future be written, on the basis of what these discussion groups decide.

The IEWG and the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to compile a consolidated document based on the outcomes/table of the discussion groups. This document is part of ASFA’s transition phase and will inform the priorities for ASFA.

Communications and Promotions Group:
1. Daryl Superio (Chair, SEAFDEC/) - Chair
2. Gabriela Silvoni (INIDEP)
3. Paula McCoy (ProQuest)
4. Apallidiya Sitepu (PDII-LIPI)
Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) presented the table (see Annex 4).

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) raised the issue of putting ASFA back in the market. What will make a user choose ASFA over SCOPUS, WoS, etc.? Why would people buy ASFA instead of these products?

Ms Silvoni said that ASFA Partners would like ProQuest to show how they market ASFA, and to advise on what they see as ASFA’s Unique Selling Points (USPs). In Ms Silvoni’s view, such ASFA content as scholarly journals, open access content and grey literature makes it unique.

Ms Pacey (NOAA) noticed that one of ASFA’s best features is that it is direct, succinct, condensed. Instead of getting a broad picture from WoS and SCOPUS users can go directly to ASFA which delivers accurate information in a faster, more efficient way.

Mr Gaibor (INR) asked about criteria for selecting the clients for the training courses and possible frequency of the courses. He also mentioned the importance of providing a link to ASFA on the library’s webpage.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented on ASFA’s USPs saying that there’s a big interaction with this group and the Policies and Strategies Group. The Policies and Strategies Group should first define what ASFA wants to be going forward, then the promotional efforts can focus on these areas.

Mr Pettman (FBA): The IEWG will bring out ASFA USPs (e.g. precision and recall from the database).

Ms Fey (NMFRI) shared her experience of inviting ProQuest sales person to provide a training on an advanced way of using ASFA in their institute.

Mr Pettman (FBA) stressed a necessity of organizing an end-user training session for ASFA partners.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) suggested the ASFA Partners to make contact with ProQuest sales representative in their country/region.

**ASFA Partnership Group**

9. Marco Montes (Chair, UNAM) - Chair
10. Arame Keita (DPM)
11. Sofia Levashova (VNIRO)
12. Mithun Mathamparambil (CSIR-NIO)
13. Vu Hau (CIS)
14. Jesús Miryam Arce Ventocilla (IMARPE)
15. Kaviphone Phouthavong (LARReC)
16. Maria Pureza (IO/USP)
17. Ramin Ketabi (IFSRI)

Mr Montes (UNAM) presented the outcomes of discussion (Table not available).

Maintaining current partners and collaborative centres: see input log (traffic lights). The group believes the partnership is performing more or less well, as most Partners are active.

The Partnership Group suggested Yearly Board Meetings were a good way of obtaining consistency. ASFA Collaborative Centers encouraged in the Partnership.

On recruiting Partners and Collaborative centres, the Group thought ASFA should commit to expanding its coverage, especially in countries where there are no national centres.

For collaborative centres, the recruitment criteria need not be too demanding but a list of requirements the institution must fulfil to become collaborative centre should be provided.

Regional Meetings – during intersessional period there was a successful Latin America mini-meeting and this is something that could be repeated in the future.
Newsletter – this would be useful to keep partners up to date, informed of activities of all members and facilitate the solution of problems. The FAO ASFA Secretariat should be responsible, with input also provided form ASFA Partners.

Networks – the group considered a formal agreement between IAMSLIC and ASFA would be useful. Also cooperation with IODE for training and looking more widely for opportunities that would improve professional development.

Set up Training of Trainers – if more ASFA Partners are able to train people in ASFA input this will help grow the Partnership without unnecessary cost.

Knowledge sharing – lots of possibilities for improving. The main area should be promoting participation of not just librarians but scientists and fishermen as well. End users very important to ASFA and they should be more involved with ASFA.

Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) said that the ASFA FAO Secretariat has responsibility to encourage ASFA partners to strengthen the partnership.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that in terms of Collaborative Partners, the responsibility up till to now has been for ASFA partners to find and manage their own Collaborative Centres. There is a strategy at place for recruitment of National ASFA Partners, but not collaborative centres. ASFA Partners are welcome to come up with this strategy and it can be shared with other partners.

Mr Montes (UNAM) said that growing the ASFA Partnership should be a joint responsibility.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) agreed that the FAO ASFA Secretariat needed partners to play their part. She said that there could be an opportunity for the new ASFA input software to have a blog and other social functions that would help with this.

Mr Gaibor (INP) suggested that in future the FAO ASFA Secretariat should be stricter with Partners. He stated that a stricter approach would also lead to more input.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) repeated her call for Partners who were down as red or orange in the table prepared by Mr Vojar (FAO ASFA Secretariat) and presented at the meeting, to speak to the FAO ASFA Secretariat at this meeting and discuss any problems they were facing with input.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the idea of twinning ASFA centres, those who are good with input can assist underperforming partners, might help increase input.

 Policies and Strategies Discussion Group
18. Peter Pissierssens (IOC) - Chair
19. Analiza Linaugo (UPV)
20. Nikita Gaibor (INR)
21. Iwona Fey (NMFRI)
22. Alice Ezuru (NaFIRRI)
23. Zhankun Wang (NMDIS)
24. Kristina Tivel (EMI)

Mr Pissierssens presented the table (see Annex 5).

On Board Meeting:

Ms Kulakova (BO MTCA) clarified that 2019 EUARSLIC meeting is taking place in Split, Croatia this year, and that the Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries in Split is collaborating ASFA Partner of ADRIAMED.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) commented that although the discussion recommended Board Meetings only last 3 days, 4 days might be better for 2019 meeting as there are a lot of changes currently taking place.

Mr Tizol Correa (CIP) mentioned that he prefers annual meetings as they are an opportunity to keep in touch and be updated on developments. He also commented on the commercial aspect of ASFA, saying that ASFA’s first objective is for people to have access to a big database they would otherwise not be able
to access. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that without the commercial aspect there would not be the funds to bring Partners to the Board Meeting.

On the Partnership Agreement and minimum input requirement:

Proof of coordination – ASFA partners need to demonstrate that they have coordinated way of recording materials on ASFA to ensure all material is covered.

Mr Superio (SEAFDEC) commented on Partners who submit 10 records or less per year saying that sometimes this is because there is insufficient literature to monitor in their country. If this is the case, would it be possible for these partners to monitor literature outside their country?

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that this was possible and some ASFA Partners might already be monitoring literature from neighboring countries.

Ms Keita (DPM) said that at the last Board Meeting in 2016 in Viet Nam, she had enquired about a Trust Fund proposal to cover the literature of countries that are not members of ASFA. The response was that this would not be possible as the Partnership agreement is signed at a national level.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that the signatory for a Trust Fund contract could only be a National Partner, was this the problem?

Ms Keita (DPM) replied that there were two problems. The first, that the ASFA Trust Fund does not cover countries that are not part of the ASFA Partnership. The second, that Partners cannot cover other countries' input because the partnership agreement was between ASFA and the national partner.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said the he recalled the discussion at last year’s meeting.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) commented that when KMFRI was the only African partner in ASFA, they covered publications from other countries. This should be permitted, although input should be transferred to those countries when/if they become ASFA partners.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that regarding regular input, it might be useful to state this in an annex to the Partnership Agreement.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) said the possibility of covering publications from non-ASFA countries should be put in the Partnership Agreement so that collaborating centres see that it is possible.

Ms Anton (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented on the minimum input requirement, that input numbers ranged from less than ten to thousands. The important thing should be that if institutions don’t have a lot of serials on their Monitoring List that those they do are kept up to date, as timeliness and coverage are also very important. This should be monitored by the ASFA Secretariat.

On Promotional Materials:

Ms Pacey (NAFO) commented that there was some overlap with this group and the Promotions Group. Mr Pissierssens said this is why he recommended a consolidated document be produced which would present all the recommendations and priorities in one place.

Ms Bazi (INRH) said she is willing to help with the design and translation of poster to promote ASFA into French.

Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) commented on the Board Meeting. She said it is important to be to be near end-users at the scientific Conferences. Next year the ICES meeting is taking place in Sweden (September 2019), and that it might be useful for ASFA to attend, either by having the Board Meeting there or perhaps a working group on the new software. She said it is important that ASFA captures the ICES community, and the meeting is a good opportunity to be in touch with them and evaluate ASFA from an end-user perspective.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that FAO would be present at this conference and perhaps could promote ASFA.
Ms Pacey (NAFO) commented that this was a good idea and a strategy used by NAFO – one person would be sent to a conference with promotional material, such as a poster, rather than sending a number of delegates.

Ms Anton (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that FAO are present at a number of conferences and meetings worldwide. The FAO ASFA Secretariat is organizing a seminar in September to present ASFA to FAO staff and also ask whether they would be able to promote ASFA when they attend such events. The ASFA Secretariat are preparing materials for FAO staff to promote ASFA worldwide.

Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that the ASFA Secretariat always tries to avoid having the ASFA Board Meeting back to back with the IAMSLIC conference. For ASFA maybe it’s better to share one day of the meeting with scientists, this is something that should be discussed in the future.

Ms Endra (NaFIRRI) said that she would like promotional material by October as it would be very useful for the IAMSLIC Conference. Ms Anton (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the FAO ASFA Secretariat is preparing a bookmark for COFI in July. Other materials are also in the pipeline and the ASFA Secretariat will do their best to get these to Ms Endra by October. Ms Endra commented that a brochure and poster would be useful, and that these could be printed locally to save FAO postage.

Ms Silvoni said that if ProQuest were not attending the IAMSLIC Conference it would be good to get some promotional materials from them, such as brochures, stands, pens, lanyards etc. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said that she did not know off-hand whether ProQuest had a representative in Uganda, or anyone who would be able to do end-user ASFA training at the IAMSLIC Conference.

Ms Endra said she would see whether this end-user training would be possible, and would discuss the possibility with the Organizing Committee. Ms McCoy said she would also try to find a ProQuest representative for this region.

**Tone of the Meeting**

Mr Mathamparambil (CSIR-NIO) said that changing the tone of the meeting to an informal one is important. In the last four days, the time in discussion groups was most productive. It’s not necessary to keep same groups but increasing interaction is important. Using the microphones and the big room can be intimidating.

Ms Pacey (NOAA) reiterated what Mr Mathamparambil said, the formality can be time consuming and constructive decision making is good for ASFA. Day Four with the presentations is always useful.

Mr Mathamparambil said that social networking or social groups had been discussed as part of the new software. Using Google groups would probably be better than the current Board-L.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) replied that not all countries can use Google, although there may be alternatives that would work. Does the discussion group feature on SharePoint allow set up of a discussion group?

[Note: the WorkingwithFAO SharePoint page already has a Team Discussion page, which has not been used.]

Ms Keita (DPM) commented that in the Partnership Agreement it says the ASFA Board Meeting should be held at least once per year. Ms Anton (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that a number of matters being discussed would impact the Partnership Agreement.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) said that having the meeting biennially is more sustainable and practical. Given the declining royalties and the information provided in the Trust Fund handout, it’s obvious that holding the meeting annually is not sustainable long term.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that holding the Board Meetings annually was a lot of work for the ASFA Secretariat. If they have more time they might be able to do more to help Partners.

Ms Anton commented that there will be opportunities to meet up intersessionally at the working group meetings. This would not cost the $80-90,000 the current annual board meeting does, but would allow those partners who are active to have opportunities to meet up and progress work on ASFA.
16.2 Impact Evaluation: Adoption of Next Steps

Prior to reviewing the Action Items for the meeting, Ms Anton summarized the responses that had been given to the post-it notes session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wishes for ASFA</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full text collection</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved software</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance partnership</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stricter requirements</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance participation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End user priority</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance database</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.3 ProQuest ASFA Update: Editorial and Platform Developments by P. McCoy (ProQuest)

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) presented her Annual ProQuest ASFA update. The emphasis was on platform developments with a focus on changes to how ProQuest ingests ASFA records and what ProQuest’s new editorial system does. See ASFA/2018/Info-6 for progress on ProQuest Editorial Content Management System (ECMS). Below is a summary of the talk and discussion which followed.

Highlights:
- STAR (old editorial system) was closed in September 2017
- FAO Monitoring List was migrated into the ProQuest Bibliographic & Rights system
- Creation of ASFA Monographs and ASFA Dissertations serial titles
- New mapping and ingestion of partner records via ProQuest Optimus pipeline using current .ISO record format

Input Centre Records Processing:
FTP site: files can’t be zipped or put in folders.

Journals coverage:
ProQuest now produce a full title list. See ASFA 2018/Info-9

Indexing Quality – General
Records are processed very fast, they appear on ProQuest platform within 30 minutes of ingestion. The indexing doesn’t appear until Ms Abram (ProQuest) adds it manually. This can take up to two days.

Editorial Content Management System
This is a content repository which can search for documents that don’t have required terms/fields, such as documents which don’t have an abstract or subject terms etc. This helps with quality control as it identifies incomplete records.
16.4 ASFA Record Processing in the ProQuest Editorial Content Management System  
by P. McCoy (ProQuest)

This section is covered in ASFA 2018/Info-6.

Following the presentation, there was one question:

Ms Pacey (NAFO) asked about fixing bibliographic errors in the records by ProQuest. She gave an example of an error in the Serial Title.

Ms McCoy answered that ProQuest is unable to fix errors in the Serial Title field, it has to be fixed in the bibliographic system and not in the editorial system. She said she would talk to Ms Pacey separately about this matter. It can be difficult to make changes to the Serial Title in the bibliographic system, so it is important that any changes made in this system are correct to avoid making more changes than necessary.

Whilst Ms McCoy gave her presentation, she mentioned that she would update the PowerPoint presentation with slides presenting changes to the way the platform present partners’ records.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed to update the PowerPoint presentation and send the updated version of the document via the ASFA Board-L.

16.5 ASFIS Subject, Geographic and Taxonomic Descriptors: suggested next steps by I. Pettman (FBA)

Mr Pettman (FBA) presented progress and plans for future development of the ASFIS tools. The information he presented is a summary of ASFA/2018/Info-5. Included below is a summary of his presentation followed the discussion that followed.

Mr Pettman summarized the progress of the various ASFIS Tools working groups, and also outlined areas for future work designed to help the end user. This came out of the action items of the 2016 AFSA Board Meeting:

Follow-up Action Item 36 from the 2016 ASFA Board Meeting:

36. Regarding future updates of the ASFAS Thesaurus .... Mr Pettman suggested another ASFA Partner be involved with FBA so as to ensure continuity in future work on the ASFAS Thesaurus, i.e. more than one ASFA Partner ..... Mr Pettman would eventually be transferring his responsibility to the new ASFA contact person at FBA

Mr Pettman (FBA) agreed to liaise with other members of the ASFAS Thesaurus Working Group (FAO, ProQuest, IFREMER, INIDEP, SEAFDEC AQD, FBA) to determine the next steps forward regarding future updates of the ASFAS Thesaurus and also to see who (of the working group) would be prepared to continue and perhaps take the lead in future activities.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that the transition phase could be used to assess some of the ASFIS tools, such as environmental regime.

Mr Pettman (FBA) strongly advised that the separate ASFIS tools working groups merge to form one overall Working Group, he listed the number of common problems facing each group to support this idea.

Questions

Mr Mathamparambil (CSIR-NIO) asked whether the new software would enable terms to be added immediately/ by assigned moderators.

Mr. Pettman (FBA) replied that this would be possible although the workflow hadn’t been agreed.

Ms. Silvoni (INIDEP) said that there should be action item to start collecting synonyms, to which Mr Pettman said that the tools are not at that stage yet, and it would be better to wait until the working group decides that this is a priority for ASFA.

The move to merge the working groups into one ASFIS tools groups was unanimously accepted. A call for partners to participate in the working group was made, interested partners were asked to contact the ASFA Secretariat or Mr Pettman.
The below presentations were given, slides are available on the FAO ASFA Workspace.

16.6 Aquatic Commons (AC) record submissions by D. Superio (SEAFDEC/AQD)

The slides of this presentation are available on the FAO ASFA Workspace.

16.7 OceanDocs demonstration by E. Kulakova (BO MTCA)

The slides of this presentation are available on the FAO ASFA Workspace.

16.8 IODE Associate Information Units by P. Pissierssens (IOC)

The slides of this presentation are available on the FAO ASFA Workspace. A summary of the presentation and the following discussion are presented here.

Mr Pissierssens spoke about the origins of IOC and IODE. He explained the difference between data and information and how these two can be confused. Associate Data Units were established to broaden participation beyond the national centers and coordinators. They were approved in 2013 and there are now 26 ADUs. Associate Information Units (AIU) were established in 2017. An AIU can be any organization/institution/project/programme with a marine science information activity that has agreed to the Terms of Reference (TORs). Mr Pissierssens outlined the TORs and the benefits for becoming AIU. The application process was provided. More information is available from the IODE website. Interested participants can contact Mr Pissierssens directly.

Questions:

Mr Gaibor (INP) asked about the difference between AIU and ADU. Mr Pissierssens explained that Associate Information Unit focused on information, and these tended to be libraries. Associate Data Units are focused on collecting data.

Mr Pissierssens further explained that the Ocean Teacher Global Academy is a programme within IODE. The IODE courses are given through Ocean Teacher Global Academy, but other parts of IOC are also welcomed. This gives IODE an opportunity to work with both information and data, e.g. GIS is data but you can add information layers, such as seeing the number of bibliographic documents on a particular area.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that FBA has a data and information service and its repository covers both. His feeling was that such a repository is an AIU rather than ADU.

Mr Pissierssens commented that in that case you can choose which it is, as it can be both or either, and generally the decision would depend on who manages it.

Mr Pettman’s second point was that the data and information service at FBA was freshwater, not marine.

Mr Pissierssens said that IODE focused on marine, although there was overlap between freshwater and marine. If it’s just lakes in the middle of a country then clearly that’s not ocean. But estuaries, mangroves are relevant to oceans.

Ms Kulakova (BO MTCA) questioned whether National Coordinators were one per country, and whether ADUs and AIUs could be multiple per country.

Mr Pissierssens said this was complicated for historical reasons. Previously, there was no network of marine libraries, so national coordinators for marine centres —were one per country. This new parallel setup, AIUs and ADUs, are many per country. There are multiple AIUs in a country. In theory you could have 100 AIUs and 1 Marine National Coordinator.


The full presentation is available from the FAO ASFA Workspace here. A summary of the presentation and the following discussion are presented here.

The Presentation covered the following topics: What is Best Practice?; The challenges of Best Practices, that despite investment in high quality measurements the quality of Best Practice Documentation varies
widely; that data and metadata formats are inconsistent; that machine readability is limited; and that sustainability is often not guaranteed.

Conclusions: it is early days for OceanBestPractices and more controlled vocabularies are needed in the system. This would allow automated indexing from docx format – the ability to automatically assign subject tags. This could be interesting technology for ASFA. This knowledge was not available in the IODE community, and external experts were brought in to develop it.

OceanBestPractices.org.net is still being developed.

Questions:

If a member of the IODE community wishes to propose a project: if you participate in the committee or are a member of the Steering group then with others you can draft a proposal. The proposal then goes to committee, which then adopts a workplan and provides some funding.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said she was interested in the automated text analytics technology. Mr Pettman (FBA) asked whether ASFA would be able to harvest this site and create ASFA records, to which Mr Pissierssens replied in the affirmative.

Mr Pettman then asked about the ontology used and whether it had any relation to the ASFA Thesaurus.

Mr Pissierssens asked to what extent are the ASFIS tools machine readable. There may be some tools that are developed and would be useful for this controlled vocabulary. Developers are not ocean experts, one vocabulary used is a chemistry vocabulary. He said he would recommend their expert contact Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) and see whether the ASFA vocabularies would be useful for OceanBestPractices.

Mr Pettman said he could supply the subject thesaurus as XML or probably RDF if Mr Pissierssens would like to pursue it further. To which Mr Pissierssens replied that that would be useful.

Mr Pettman said that the new terms being added to the subject thesaurus were being added according to ontology principles, so that it could be developed into an ontology at a later date.

Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) said that yesterday the Working Group discussed ASFIS tools, how they might be developed in the new software and also discussed the possibility of starting work on synonyms that could be added.

Mr Mathamparambil (CSIR-NIO) asked whether the thesaurus could be exported in SKOS format, to which Mr Pettman replied in the affirmative.

16.10 Information about Aquatic New Index (ANI) by D. Superio (SEAFDEC/AQD)

Following this presentation there was a discussion on whether all ASFA Partners could contribute to an international repository of news clippings on aquatic and marine sciences.

Ms Keita (DPM) asked whether the newspapers are online or not. Mr Superio said that the online news articles in the Philippines are only available for 2-3 months at which point they are taken down from the website. So, it is essential to collect this information in a stable format.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said that it’s a very interesting idea however getting permission to collect the content from the newspapers may be an issue.

16.11 Feedback on new approach to the meeting

ASFA Partners were asked if they had any feedback on the changes that were discussed in the meeting and also what they thought of the new format of the meeting.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) said more progress would come from working in the groups rather than discussing the same problems each year. The format is also improving and the report can probably be more succinct, Partners don’t need full detail.

Ms Fey (NMFRI) commented that the meeting has provided some very useful information about the various ASFA projects. Providing this information makes Partners feel involved in the situation and that should happen each year.
Mr Pissierssens (IOC) remarked that some of the improvements had come from the working groups, and that there should be less reading of reports and more done online. He also suggested an action paper to be compiled prior to the meeting, this would include draft decisions discussed in advance or introduction to this transition paper. These could then be briefly discussed in advance and then quickly decided upon at the meeting.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that the FAO ASFA Secretariat and himself have learnt that more consideration of the timing of workshops and discussion groups should be given, to allow participants enough time to get their opinions across.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) commented that Action Items could be compiled in a table, and be made more visual so as to be better understood.

Lastly, Ms Anton asked whether any of the Participants would like to be interviewed tomorrow morning for a FAO Podcast. Ms Pacey (NAFO), Ms Silvoni (INIDEP), Ms Levashova (VNIRO) and Mr Zuraimi (UMT) all volunteered.

Friday 15th June

17. REVIEW/ APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING

The Action Items were discussed, voted on and approved.

Discussion was held as to the next ASFA Board Meeting, provisionally agreed to take place in 2019. Mr Zuraimi (UMT) suggested that Malaysia would be able to host the meeting. Mr Marco Montes also said he would make enquiries as to whether Mexico would be able to host the meeting.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/12</td>
<td>NAFO Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/13</td>
<td>PIMRIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/14</td>
<td>SEAFDEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/15</td>
<td>SPC Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/16</td>
<td>WCPFC Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/17</td>
<td>Argentina (INIDEP) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/18</td>
<td>Botswana (ORI) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/19</td>
<td>Brazil (USP) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/20</td>
<td>Canada (Fisheries and Oceans) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/21</td>
<td>Chile (IFOP) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/22</td>
<td>China (NMDIS) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/23</td>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire (CRO) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/24</td>
<td>Cuba (CIP) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/26</td>
<td>Egypt (NIOF) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/27</td>
<td>Estonia (EMI) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/28</td>
<td>France (IFREMER) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 29</td>
<td>Greece (HCMR) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 30</td>
<td>Iceland (MRI) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 31</td>
<td>India (NIO/NICMAS) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 32</td>
<td>Indonesia (PDII/ LIPI) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 33</td>
<td>Iran, Islamic Rep. of (IFRO) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 34</td>
<td>Ireland (MI) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 35</td>
<td>Italy (SIBM) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 36</td>
<td>Japan (FRA) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 37</td>
<td>Kenya (KMFRI) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 38</td>
<td>Korea, Rep. of (KIOST) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 40</td>
<td>Malaysia (UMT) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 41</td>
<td>Mauritania (IMROP) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 42</td>
<td>Mexico (DGB) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 43</td>
<td>Morocco (INRH) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 44</td>
<td>Mozambique (INAHINA) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 45</td>
<td>Namibia (NatMIRC) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 46</td>
<td>Nigeria (NIFFR) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 47</td>
<td>Norway (IMR) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 48</td>
<td>Peru (IMARPE) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 49</td>
<td>Philippines (UPV) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 50</td>
<td>Poland (NMFRI) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 51</td>
<td>Portugal (IPMAR) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 53</td>
<td>Senegal (DPM) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 54</td>
<td>Spain (IEO) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 55</td>
<td>Tanzania, United Rep. of (IMS) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 56</td>
<td>Thailand (Chula) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 57</td>
<td>Tunisia (INSTM) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 58</td>
<td>Uganda (NaFIRRI) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 59</td>
<td>Ukraine (YugNIRO) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 60</td>
<td>United Kingdom (FBA) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 60a</td>
<td>FBA ASFA Trust Fund Proposal - ASFA Record Preparation for a further approximately 1,000 UK University PhD and MSc Theses relating to Aquaculture, Fisheries and other ASFA relevant topics from 1965 to 2010 now available as Open Access documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 61</td>
<td>Uruguay (IIP) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 62</td>
<td>USA (NOAA) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 63</td>
<td>Viet Nam (CIS) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 64</td>
<td>ProQuest Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 65</td>
<td>ASFA Trust Fund Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 66</td>
<td>ProQuest Calculation of Royalty Payment to ASFA Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 67</td>
<td>List of ASFA Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 68</td>
<td>19th Report of Project to Distribute ASFA to LIFDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 69</td>
<td>ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – <em>Financial support to attend 2019 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 70</td>
<td>Contributions (input) to ASFA Database by Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ 71</td>
<td>List of all ASFA Advisory Board Meetings and Editorial Staff Meetings to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-2</td>
<td>List of ASFA Partners and date of joining ASFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-3</td>
<td>New ASFA software project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-3a</td>
<td>ASFA Internet connectivity Survey: Summary of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-4</td>
<td>Discussion Paper: Planned steps to conducting an Impact Evaluation of ASFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-5</td>
<td>ASFIS Subject, Geographic and Taxonomic Descriptors: Information Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-7</td>
<td>Geographic names added to ProQuest Authority File, 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-8</td>
<td>Taxonomic names added to ProQuest Authority File, 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-9</td>
<td>ProQuest ASFA Title List, May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-10</td>
<td>Screencast: Natalie Abram (ProQuest) demonstrates the processing of ASFA input partner records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-11</td>
<td>Briefing Note: A case study on the Use of the International Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts Database / by D.J Castillo, B.H. MacDonald, S.S. Soomai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA/2018/ Info-12</td>
<td>Proposed ASFA Trust Fund annual allocation schemes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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National Marine Data and Information Service (NMDIS)
State Oceanic Administration of China (SOA)
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State Oceanic Administration of China (SOA)
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ESTONIA
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Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu
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E-mail: kristina.tiivel@ut.ee / URL: http://www.sea.ee

FRANCE
Ms Jacqueline Prod’homme
Institut français de recherche pour l’exploitation de la mer (IFREMER)
155 rue Jean-Jacques Rousseau
92138 Issy-les-Moulineau Cedex
France
Tel: +33 61307 7409 (mobile)
E-mail: jacquelineprodhomme53@gmail.com
URL: http://www.ifremer.fr / http://www.ifremer.fr/blp

INDIA
Mr Mithun Raj Mathamparambil
CSIR National Institute of Oceanography (CSIR-NIO)
Library
Dona Paula, 403 004, Goa, India
Tel. +91 (0) 832 2450 275 (Direct) / Fax: + 91 (0) 832 2450 601
E-mail: mithunm@nio.org / URL: http://www.nio.org

INDONESIA
Ms Apallidya Sitepu
Centre for Scientific Documentation and Information
Indonesian Institute of Sciences (PDII-LIPI)
Jl. Gatot Subroto 10
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Tel : +62-021-5733465 / Fax : +62-021-573-3467
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IRAN
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Iranian Fisheries Science Research Institute (IFSRI)
No. 5, Mashahir Ave.
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National Research Institute of Fisheries Science, Fisheries Research Agency (FRA)  
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Mr Kaviphone Phouthavong  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute  
Living Aquatic Resources Research Center (LARReC)  
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Malaysia  
Mr Mohd Shahrulnizam Zuraimi  
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu (UMT)  
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Annex-4: Minutes of Action Items and Decisions Agreed at the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting

[Note: Brief discussion is included for some of the Action Items/Decisions in order to put them into context/perspective. The full discussions will be reflected in the Minutes of the Report, which will be completed and circulated to the participants of this meeting within 6-8 weeks]

The 46th Annual Meeting of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board was hosted by the International Oceanographic Data and Information Exchange (IODE) and took place from 11 to 15 June 2018 at the UNESCO/IOC Project Office for IODE, in Oostende, Belgium. The meeting was opened by Mr. Peter Pissierssens, Head of the UNESCO/IOC Project Office for IODE and Mr Marc Taconet, Head, Fisheries Statistics and Information Branch, FAO. The Meeting was attended by 38 participants, representing 33 ASFA Partners. Mr Ian Pettman (FBA) chaired the Meeting and the Agenda was completed on time. The main rapporteur was Ms Maria Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) and Ms Tamsin Vicary (FAO ASFA Secretariat) was assistant rapporteur.

**Agenda Item 6.5 Partners removed or in danger of being removed from ASFA**

ASFA Partners called to attention:

1. Egypt/NIOF - The last input submitted by NIOF was in 2010. Two persons from NIOF were trained in 2014, however, to date no input has been submitted. FAO ASFA Secretariat has tried to contact Egypt via e-mail regarding ASFA in March 2018 with no success.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to make one final attempt to contact NIOF in order to inform them that they will be dropped from the ASFA Partnership unless they confirm interest in remaining within the Partnership.

2. Iceland/MRI - The last input submitted by MRI was in 2010. The FAO ASFA Secretariat contacted MFRI (the institute was established in July 2016 as a result of a merger of the Institute of Freshwater Fisheries and the Marine Research Institute (MRI)). Ms. Stefánsdóttir, MFRI librarian has been assigned by the MFRI director as a contact person. At this writing, we are awaiting a reply from MRI.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to make a final attempt to make contact.

3. UN Environment (formerly UNEP) - The FAO ASFA Secretariat contacted UN Environment in February 2018 regarding UN Environment’s continuing participation in the ASFA Partnership (contact details provided by Mr Mika Odido, IOC Coordinator in Africa, UNESCO Regional Office for Eastern Africa). Ms Von Moltke (anja.moltke@un.org) has been assigned as a contact person. At time of writing, we are awaiting a reply from UN Environment.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to keep open the possibility for UN Environment to resume active participation in the ASFA Partnership. The ASFA Secretariat will make another attempt to contact UN Environment.

**Situations Pending:**

4. Whilst discussing the involvement of current ASFA National Partner for Thailand, Mr Superio (SEAFDEC/AQD) mentioned that he has the contact details for another university in Thailand that may be interested in joining the ASFA Partnership.

Mr Superio (SEAFDEC/AQD) agreed to provide contact details of Kasetsart University in Thailand regarding joining the ASFA Partnership.

5. WCPFC: No follow up with this institution during the intersessional period.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up with WCPFC after the meeting.
Agenda Item 6.6.1 Potential Partners

6. Whilst discussing the search for a German National Partner, Mr Pettman (FBA) mentioned that Ms Barbara Schmidt from Kiel University (Germany) might know of an institution willing to take on the responsibility of being an ASFA Partner.

Mr Pettman (FBA) agreed to contact Ms Schmidt at Kiel University (Germany) regarding the search for a National ASFA Partner in Germany. [Timeline: by 31 July 2018]

7. Whilst discussing potential ASFA partners, Mr Gaibor (INP) mentioned that he has visited INVEMAR (Institute for Marine and Coastal Research from Colombia) and explained the importance of participation in ASFA to the institute’s authorities. As a result, INVEMAR has shown an interest to become the ASFA partner.

Mr Gaibor (INP) agreed to contact potential ASFA Partner in Colombia and ask them to contact the ASFA Secretariat directly.

Agenda Item 6.8 ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest

8. Whilst discussing the new Publishing Agreement, it has been proposed by the ASFA Secretariat to have a meeting with ProQuest to discuss and agree on details of the new Publishing Agreement.

The ASFA Secretariat agreed to liaise with ProQuest regarding the dates and place for the meeting which should be held in January-February 2019 and be attended by representatives from FAO (the ASFA Secretariat), ProQuest and IEWG. FAO (Mr Taconet) will try to identify 1-2 high-level managers in the ASFA partner institutions to join the meeting.

Agenda Item 7 Impact Evaluation and future development plans for ASFA

Proposed Analyses:

9. One of the analyses the Impact Evaluation Working Group (IEWG) proposes to undertake is an end user survey that Mr Pettman (FBA) will conduct at his institution… following discussion it was agreed that the survey should be conducted at all ASFA Partner institutions. The survey will be distributed (online and print) to all ASFA Partners. Partners will then disseminate the survey in their institutions (for example to researchers, students, scientists etc.) and the results will be gathered and analysed by the ASFA Secretariat.

The ASFA Secretariat and Mr Pettman (FBA) agreed to design a survey assessing the usefulness of ASFA to end-users.

Media, including social media:

10. The importance of promoting ASFA on different media, particularly social media, was raised... Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that ProQuest has an active social media presence and can help raise awareness of ASFA by retweeting.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to set up a Promotions and Communications Working Group.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed to liaise with ProQuest’s social media team to assist promotion.

11. Ms Anton (FAO) proposed the idea of a newsletter… this would keep Partners up to date with ASFA developments and also allow them to promote their institutions. A vote was held and the decision made to set up a newsletter.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to set up a newsletter. [Timeline: by September-October 2018]

Agenda Item 8.2 Alternative software

12. Following presentation of an alternative software, partners requested further details on iMarine and also asked the ASFA Secretariat to consider DSpace which is used by a number of partners. Partners also expressed an interest in being involved with the development and testing stages of the new software.
Ms Vicary (FAO) agreed to distribute in two weeks’ time a summary of presentation and feedback gathered. A call for volunteers for development and testing phases to software to be included. Decision for software to be made by 31 August 2018.

[Note, following a return to office these deadlines do not provide enough time to collate the necessary information. Therefore the decision has been made to circulate a summary of software options by no later than 31 August 2018, and to make a decision on the software by no later than 30 September 2018.]

**Agenda Item 9.1 Number of records from database partners’ input logs**

13. Following discussions on the number of records from database partners’ input logs, Mr Peter Pisserssens (IOC) asked why the number of records remained stable at 15,000 each year when the amount of literature being published was increasing each year. Harvesting records was suggested as a way not only of increasing records but encouraging recently dropped partners to re-join the ASFA Partnership.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to investigate possibility of a pilot project with a recently dropped off partner to discover whether harvesting records or a different partnership model would allow them to stay in the ASFA Partnership. A project team would be needed to take it forward. [Timeline: 2019 when new software is in place]

**Agenda Item 9.2.1 Current ASFA Subject Scope and its possible expansion**

14. A survey had been sent to ASFA Partners asking whether they objected to the removal of subject category codes… after a brief discussion a vote was held and no partners objected to them being removed.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to remove the subject category codes in the new software. [Timeline: 2019 when new software is in place]

**Agenda Item 9.3 Grey Literature**

15. Regarding the time it takes to translate abstracts from their original language into English… ASFA Partners commented this could be time consuming and delay input. Mr Superio (SEAFDEC/AQD) said standard templates for Grey Literature documents, such as annual reports, might be able to assist inputters. Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that an automatic translation button on the software would assist input.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to ask software developers whether an automatic translation button for the new software could be provided and also investigate standard templates for English abstracts.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed to look into what help ProQuest can provide.

**Agenda Item 10.2 ASFA CD/ DVD ROM**

16. Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported on the survey sent to partners asking them whether they required the ASFA CD, or DVD, both, or neither… Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that knowing exact numbers of how many CDs and DVDs to produce would help ProQuest.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to send exact numbers of who needs CDs and/or DVDs to ProQuest. [Timeline: by 15 July 2018].

**Agenda Item 10.3 Internet Database Service**

17. Ms Silvoni (INIDEP) had a suggestion for the ProQuest search platform. In SCOPUS, users can search using a combination of Title AND Keywords AND Abstract. This option is given as a default on the search interface, whereas in ASFA it would have to be set up manually…Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said she would like the ASFA Partnership to discuss whether they agree with Ms Silvoni’s suggestion and would like to see this change on ASFA… and agreed to survey Partners on this.
Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed to survey ASFA partners and ask whether they would like to see more or different features on the advanced search on ProQuest platform. Specifically, Ms Silvoni asked for a search option that combined: Abstract AND Title AND Keywords. [Timeline: by 15 July 2018]

18. Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that there are a number of new search features on the new editorial platform, some of which he was unsure how to use and needed to ask Ms McCoy (ProQuest). He suggested some user training on ProQuest platform would be useful.

ProQuest, the ASFA Secretariat and any interested partners agreed to put together training session on searching the ASFA database on ProQuest. [Timeline: by 31 December 2018]

**Agenda Item 10.6 Document Delivery**

19. Mr Superio (SEAFDEC/AQD) presented a step-by-step process of submitting an ILL.

Mr Superio (SEAFDEC/AQD) agreed to resend tutorial on submitting an ILL. [This Action Item was completed June 2018]

**Agenda Item 11 Report on ASFA Training Activities**

20. Mr Mathamparambil (CSIR-NIO) asked what remote training facilities the FAO ASFA Secretariat has and whether it is possible to connect to Partners’ computers or networks… Ms Vicary (FAO) responded that she was not aware of any service that would allow this, but that this could be investigated.

Ms Vicary (FAO) agreed to investigate whether it is possible to connect to other institutions network/computers remotely and assist with software problems. [Timeline: by 31 December 2018]

**Agenda Item 12 Status of ASFIS Reference Series Publications**

21. Mr Pettman has revised the guidelines for geographic indexing (ASFIS 5)…the revised guidelines should be published now as it will save constructing strings that do not fit the new system.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to publish new guidelines for geo-indexing, to be made available electronically to all partners. [Timeline: by 31 December 2018]

22. During the intersessional period, the FBA undertook alterations to relationships in ASFIS-6, the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus. The FBA then produced revised versions of all these tools in the requested formats.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to publish the master file for the printed version of the Thesaurus. [Timeline: by 31 December 2018]

23. Following Action item 37 from the 2016 Board Meeting…Ms Levashova (VNIRO) said she had a new batch of terms to be added to the translated thesaurus terms.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) and Ms Kalentsits (FAO ASFA Secretariat) agreed to liaise on updating Russian-English set of subject terms

24. Ms Bazi (INRH) stated that she had a set of translated subject terms that she would like uploading onto the ASFA Work Space

Ms Bazi (INRH) agreed to send list of subject terms she has, to be posted on the FAO ASFA Workspace.

**Agenda Item 13.1 Status of the ASFA Trust Fund**

25. Mr Pissierssens (IOC) said more work should be done to find out why the royalties are declining and if this is expected to continue…this should be investigated to help inform future spending… other funding options should also be investigated.
The FAO ASFA Secretariat, IOC, and ProQuest agreed to discuss projections for future income (i.e. royalties from ProQuest). An initial draft report will be prepared and presented to the Board. This report may result in changes in future expenditure. [Timeline: by 30th November 2018]

**Agenda Item 13.3 New ASFA Trust Fund Proposals**


This proposal requests funding to support the attendance of ASFA Partners at the 2019 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal to fund the attendance of ASFA Partners at the 2019 ASFA Board Meeting.

27. **Regarding the SEAFDEC/AQD (Philippines) Trust Fund Proposal: Digitisation, Open Access Deposition and the provision of URLs to Existing ASFA Records of the Conference Proceedings Published by SEAFDEC Secretariat, Training Department (TD), Marine Fisheries Research Department (MFRD), Marine Fishery Resources Development and Management Department (MFRDMD), and Aquaculture Department (AQD) – ASFA/2018/14a US$18,466**

This proposal aims to digitise and make available the full text of no less than 850 documents, mainly SEAFDEC conference proceedings. Documents will be deposited on an Open Access repository and ASFA records with links to the full text will be created. If records already exist on ASFA, then URLs will be added.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal for the digitisation, open access deposition and ASFA records preparation of SEAFDEC/AQD documents.

28. **Regarding the FBA (UK) proposal: ASFA Record Preparation for a further approximately 1,000 UK University PhD and MSc Theses relating to Aquaculture, Fisheries and other ASFA relevant topics from 1965 to 2010 now available as Open Access documents – ASFA/2018/60a US$23,540**

This proposal aims to prepare ASFA records for approximately 1000 UK University PhD and MSc Theses relating to aquaculture, fisheries and other ASFA relevant topics from 1965 to 2010.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal for the preparation of ASFA records for UK University PhD and MSc Theses.

29. **The FAO ASFA Secretariat will not be requesting funds because of sufficient carry over of funds from previous years.**

The ASFA Board approved the proposal for the FAO ASFA Secretariat not to request funds.

30. **Ms Pacey (NAFO) asked whether there were guidelines or a form on how to submit an ASFA Trust Fund proposal.**

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to prepare guidelines on how to submit Trust Fund proposals. [Timeline: by 30 November 2018]

**Agenda Item 14 Other Business**

31. **Ms Paula McCoy (ProQuest) stated that her ProQuest Report ASFA/2018/64 contained an error she was only made aware of on Monday 11th June, regarding ASFA customer numbers.**

Ms McCoy agreed to update ProQuest Report with new Sales statistics that she received from ProQuest during the meeting and to send the updated version of the document via the ASFA Board-L. [This Action Item was completed June 2018]

**Agenda Item 15 Place and date of next ASFA Advisory Board Meeting**

32. A place and date for next meeting was discussed. Mr Zuraimi (UMT) said UMT (Malaysia) would consider hosting the meeting. Mr Montes (UNAM) said he would also enquire about whether UNAM
(Mexico) could host the meeting, although he foresaw difficulties in it doing so. Ms Tiivel (EMI) has also agreed to investigate the possibility of hosting 2019 or 2020 ASFA Board meeting in Estonia.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to follow up with Mr Zuraimi (UMT), Mr Montes (UNAM) and Ms Tiivel (EMI) regarding hosting the 2019 ASFA Board meeting.

**Agenda Item 16: Special Topics, Demonstrations, Workshop Day**

Impact Evaluation: Brainstorming Session, presentation of discussions held by Working Groups

33. **Mr Pissierssens (IOC)** suggested that a consolidated document for the vision for ASFA’s future be written, on the basis of what the discussion groups have decided.

The **IEWG and the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to compile a consolidated document based on the outcomes/table of the discussion groups. This document is part of ASFA’s transition phase and will inform the priorities for ASFA. [**Timeline: by 15 August 2018**].

ProQuest ASFA Update: Editorial and Platform Developments

34. **Whilst Ms McCoy (ProQuest) gave her presentation on ProQuest Editorial and Platform Developments**, she mentioned that she would update the PowerPoint presentation with slides presenting changes to the way the platform present partners’ records.

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to update the PowerPoint presentation and send the updated version of the document via the ASFA Board-L. [**This Action Item was completed June 2018**]

ASFIS Subject, Geographic and Taxonomic Descriptors: Suggested Next Steps

35. **Following a presentation by Mr Pettman (FBA) (ASFA/2018/Info-5), the ASFA Board agreed that the various working groups covering the ASFIS Reference Tools should merge to form one Working Group. Partners interested in joining the new Working Group should contact the ASFA Secretariat or Mr Pettman (FBA).**

**Mr Pettman (FBA) agreed** to merge the different ASFIS reference tools working groups into one group. The new group will decide on and prioritize future activities. [**Timeline: starting from July 2018, ongoing**].
Annex-5: Consolidated outcome of the 2018 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting

Introduction:

This document consolidates the changes and enhancements to ASFA proposed by the Discussion Groups held at the 2018 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (ABM) and represents the first steps in ASFA’s transition phase to an efficient partnership that uses modern technologies to produce a valued information product. The 2018 Board Meeting introduced the need for ASFA to change. Technological advances present both challenges and opportunities to ASFA, and it is vital that ASFA modernizes to ensure it remains a valued information product to its various stakeholders (FAO, ASFA Partners and end-users) as well as more widely to the fields of fisheries and aquatic sciences. As announced at the 2018 ABM, ASFA can no longer afford the ‘business as usual’ approach and must adapt in order to retain its position as the leading database for aquatic science, fisheries and aquaculture information.

Four discussion groups were held at the 2018 ABM and resulted in a number of positive and useful suggestions from ASFA Partners. These proposals have been consolidated by the Impact Evaluation Working Group (IEWG) and are presented here in this document. The document is split into three sections:

1. **Selection of new business model for ASFA:** This section consolidates the actions and recommendations presented at the 2018 ABM and, reflecting the need to change, presents three possible business models.
2. **Future actions to be decided by the IEWG:** This section presents the areas ASFA must change to ensure it remains a valued product. A table presents what the future goals of the ASFA products, ASFA users, ASFA Partnership and the ASFA Secretariat should be in order to ensure ASFA remains a valued information product.
3. **Immediate actions agreed upon by the ASFA Board:** This section focuses on the processes required to modernize ASFA, the majority of which have already been agreed upon at the 2018 ABM. They include the changes that were proposed by the Discussion Groups and the “wish list” of the ABM18 IE session. The ASFA Secretariat is already in the process of implementing the changes detailed in this section, and the IEWG thanks all participants of the discussion groups for their work.

Accompanying this document is a three year timeline which details when these actions will take place. Also included in ASFA Partners may also wish to consult the Impact Evaluation Plan for a more detailed description of the surveys and analyses which the IEWG intends to undertake.

We welcome any comment or feedback, please send to ASFA-Secretariat@fao.org

1. **Selection of New Business Model for ASFA**

Having decided that ASFA can no longer afford the ‘business as usual’ approach, a number of ideas were proposed at the 2018 ABM. These included Open Access, full text and thematic products produced separately from the commercial database. The IEWG has consolidated these suggestions and proposed three new business models. A project team will be set up to investigate the implications of each model.
and ultimately to select the best option for ASFA. Their results will be shared with the IEWG and presented at the 2019 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting.

Current ASFA Business Model:

1. **Commercial only product** – This is the current set up where the ASFA database is only accessible to subscribers (ASFA Partners receive subscription for free). With the steep reduction of royalties that has been seen in recent years, this option is no longer a viable way to sustain the work of the ASFA partnership.

**Proposed ASFA Business Models:**

1. **Continue with commercial product but provide grey literature and selected journals (those not covered by ProQuest) through a separate database that would be accessible freely.** ASFA could continue with the commercially published database but build a separate database, possibly under a new name, to provide Open Access to grey literature documents and bibliographic records of journals not currently indexed by ProQuest. ASFA would need to keep within the terms of the publishing agreement, or negotiate new terms, in order for both the commercial and Open Access databases to be viable.

2. **Continue with commercial product but develop standalone products on key topics such as SDGs.** This option is similar to the above, but would look for project funding to develop separate domain specific databases that would be openly searchable. Again, this would require ASFA to stay within the terms of the publishing agreement.

3. **Develop an openly searchable platform to store and display all ASFA records.** ASFA could develop a database on a new platform that would store and make openly searchable all ASFA records. This option would have a major impact on the terms of the publishing agreement and may require ASFA to exempt itself from royalty payments. However, building a non-commercial product would enable greater flexibility for ASFA to participate in projects and partnerships with UN and other organizations and would also greatly increase access to information. The ASFA Secretariat has discussed developing a bibliographic database in partnership with AGRIS that would be hosted by FAO. Were such a database to go ahead, it would mean all ASFA records would be openly searchable on the web. ASFA partners could continue contribute their records to the database (in a far more time efficient manner). Whether ProQuest would continue to publish the ASFA database, and under what terms, would need to be agreed by ProQuest and FAO Legal departments.

The Project Team will investigate these options, including the cost they are likely to entail, and make recommendations on which option to pursue. The impact that a new business model will have on the Publishing agreement; royalties; and operational arrangements such as management of the database and quality control, will all be of significant importance.

**2. Future actions to be decided by the IEWG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Future goals</th>
<th>How to proceed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASFA Product</strong></td>
<td><strong>The database provides access to abstracts of journals and grey literature,</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASFA Partners listed full text as a priority area for ASFA in the future. Full text provision to be a focus of ASFA, based on which of the above three business models is selected.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA Users</td>
<td>ASFA users are: Institutions which subscribe to ASFA and Institutions in LIFDCs are able to access ASFA free of charge</td>
<td>Subscription options should cover individual subscriptions and subscriptions to the ASFA database as a standalone product. LIFDCs/ Developing Countries: the LIFDC programme should better align ASFA to FAO, UN and other founding partners’ goals of providing access to information to developing countries. Different models to be explored such as free access or lower rates for developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA Partnership</td>
<td>ASFA Partners are made up of FAO (ASFA Secretariat); other UN agencies; ProQuest (ASFA Publisher); International and National Partners and their collaborative centres.</td>
<td>As a minimum, ASFA Collaborative Centers to be granted full access to the ASFA database. Other partnership models are to be explored by the IEWG, options include: • More than one National Partner; • Different levels of partnership (e.g. for institutions whose records ASFA harvests); • Better ways to share knowledge and skills, either independently or in collaboration with existing programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA Secretariat</td>
<td>Current focus is on preparation of ASFA meetings, training and quality control of ASFA records.</td>
<td>ASFA Secretariat to focus on improvements that will benefit the end user of ASFA, to include: improvements to ASFA database; seeking external project funding; exploring new ASFA products; and increasing access to information in developing countries. Immediate priority is to be the ASFA input software which will facilitate the above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Immediate actions agreed upon at the 2018 ASFA Board Meeting

The below table presents the initial processes required to begin implementing the above changes. These changes were proposed by the discussion groups and have already been approved by the ABM. All of
these changes have either been implemented, or are in the process of being implemented, by the ASFA Secretariat. The proposals have been divided into four areas: ASFA Products, ASFA Users, ASFA Partnership and ASFA Secretariat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Future goals</th>
<th>How to proceed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASFA Products</strong></td>
<td>ASFA Input Software: currently unworkable on modern computers&lt;br&gt; Inefficient workflow for creating and publishing ASFA records.&lt;br&gt; Metadata fields are too numerous and do not correspond to any modern standards</td>
<td>Software to be upgraded so it is browser based and allows importing and exporting of various standards of metadata and/ or harvesting of metadata.&lt;br&gt; Streamline publishing records process, including import/export and harvesting options in the new software. Number of metadata fields ASFA records use to be reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASFA Users</strong></td>
<td>Little is known about ASFA users at partner institutions</td>
<td>IEWG to compile user surveys in order to discover more about the information needs of fisheries, aquaculture and aquatic science researchers and students.&lt;br&gt; The link between ASFA Partners and end-users to be reinforced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASFA Partnership</strong></td>
<td>Advisory Board meets annually and lasts five days</td>
<td>Advisory Board Meetings to be held every two years, structure of meetings to change and tone to be less formal. Meetings are likely to last 3/4 days in the future. The Meeting will also be used to better promote ASFA to end users at the host’s institution/ country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Groups: set up and managed in ad-hoc way</td>
<td>Possible remote participation. As a response to feedback, more opportunities for discussion and interaction will be provided at meetings. Working Groups are to be managed by ASFA Secretariat and report to ASFA Advisory Board. Working Groups to include: Impact Evaluation Working Group; ASFIS Tools; and ASFA Software (to be set up in September 2018). Partner reports to be compiled using a survey. ASFA Secretariat reports to be condensed and the format updated. As a minimum, the requirement of 100 ASFA records per year in order to qualify for financial support to attend Board meeting is to be enforced. Funding for travel to the meeting to be based on royalty projections and discussed at 2019 ABM. ASFA trainings to partners enhanced, number of trainings increased and used to promote ASFA. Encourage more partner-to-partner training and regional training focal points.</td>
<td>All Working groups are to have defined objectives, timelines and TORs, to be adopted at the 2019 Advisory Board Meeting. ASFA Secretariat and IEWG to set up surveys and disseminate three months prior to next board meeting. Minimum requirement of records to be enforced, funding of travel and Board Meeting attendance to be reviewed as part of Trust Fund expenditure review. ASFA Input Procedures training shortened, curricula updated and number of trainees per session increased. Online and e-learning to be made use of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports: formal and time consuming to prepare</td>
<td>Financial support for ASFA Partners: currently given to attend board meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support for ASFA Partners: currently given to attend board meetings</td>
<td>Training: 5 days ASFA Input procedures training once per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA Secretariat</td>
<td>Financial management of ASFA Trust Fund: projects are proposed and almost always approved</td>
<td>Trust fund projects to be aligned to ASFA’s goals, for example to focus on SDGs or particular aspect of grey literature to ensure best outcome for expenditure of funds. A funding cycle which permits submissions for Trust Fund projects once during the year, rather than on a rolling basis, to be implemented. Funding for various ASFA projects to be pursued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Promotion: No coordinated promotion of ASFA by ProQuest and ASFA Secretariat, little promotion of ASFA as standalone product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing Agreement: currently runs until December 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA Secretariat and Publisher to adopt a collaborative approach to promotion of ASFA. ASFA Partners also contribute to promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy to focus on unique content of ASFA and be reflective of any changes proposed by the IEWG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA Secretariat to set up a newsletter that will be circulated twice a year keeping partners and ASFA users up to date with developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA Secretariat would like better reporting of royalties from ProQuest. Other changes to the publishing agreement are likely to be required, based on the business model ASFA decides to pursue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFA Secretariat and ProQuest to form collaborative promotional strategy. ASFA Secretariat to make available to ASFA Partners materials to promote ASFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First issue of newsletter to be sent by end of October 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting to be held with ProQuest in early 2019, to discuss negotiation of new publishing agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>